## BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE: ) PERMITTING AND )
ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE )

DATE AND TIME: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1997 9:30 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD HEARING ROOM 8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, RPR, CSR CERTIFICATE NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 42103

## APPEARANCES

MR. ROBERT FRAZEE, CHAIRMAN (NOT PRESENT)

MR. STEVEN R. JONES, MEMBER

MR. PAUL RELIS, MEMBER

## STAFF PRESENT

MR. KEITH SMITH, DEPUTY DIRECTOR

MS. KATHRYN TOBIAS, LEGAL COUNSEL

MS. LORI LOPEZ, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

## INDEX

	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER	7
EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS	20

- ITEM 1: REPORT FROM THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR
- ITEM 2: CONSIDERATION OF A NEW SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE UNIVERSAL REFUSE REMOVAL RECYCLING AND TRANSFER FACILITY, SAN DIEGO COUNTY.
- ITEM 3: (PULLED) CONSIDERATION OF A MODIFIED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE BENO LANDFILL, MONO COUNTY.
- ITEM 4: (PULLED) CONSIDERATION OF A MODIFIED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE CHALFANT LANDFILL, MONO COUNTY.
- ITEM 5: CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE MIDVALLEY LANDFILL, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY.
- ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE CALIFORNIA STREET LANDFILL, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE MUSTANG HILL LANDFILL, KINGS COUNTY.
- ITEM 8: CONSIDERATION OF A SITE FOR THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL AND CODISPOSAL SITE CLEANUP PROGRAM.
- ITEM 9: DISCUSSION OF A DRAFT REGULATIONS TO ESTABLISH FILING DATES FOR BOARD ACTION ON PROPOSED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT.
- ITEM 10: OPEN DISCUSSION.
- ITEM 11: ADJOURNMENT

```
1
      SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1997
 2
 3
                          9:30 A.M.
              CHAIRMAN JONES: GOOD MORNING AND WELCOME
 5
 6
      TO THE OCTOBER 16TH MEETING OF THE PERMITTING AND
      ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE. BEFORE LORI TAKES THE ROLL,
 7
      I WILL SAY THAT MR. FRAZEE IS STUCK ON THE EAST
 8
9
     COAST DUE TO SOME PROBLEMS WITH THE BUILDING, I
10
      GUESS, FOR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS, THAT THEY ALL
11
      GOT SICK OR SOMETHING. SO HE'S STUCK, COULDN'T
      MAKE IT. AND SO MR. RELIS AND I ARE GOING TO HOLD
12
13
     DOWN THE FORT TODAY.
14
                   LORI, COULD YOU TAKE THE ROLL,
     PLEASE.
15
         THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
16
17
        CHAIRMAN JONES: HERE.
             THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
18
             MEMBER RELIS: HERE.
19
               THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE. ABSENT.
20
               CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. FOR ANY OF YOU OUT
21
THERE WISHING TO SPEAK TO AN ITEM, THERE ARE
23 SPEAKER SLIPS IN THE BACK OF THE ROOM. IF YOU FILL
```

- THEM OUT AND BRING THEM FORWARD TO LORI, WE WOULD
- 25 APPRECIATE THAT. AND I WILL ASK IF THERE'S ANY EX

- 1 PARTES.
- 2 MEMBER RELIS: YES, MR. CHAIR. I JUST HAD
- 3 A CONVERSATION WITH LARRY SWEETSER, NORCAL,
- 4 REGARDING HIS ITEM COMING BEFORE US.
- 5 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. AND I -- NOT ON AN
- 6 ITEM HERE, BUT JUST A QUICK UPDATE. I SPOKE WITH
- 7 GEORGE LARSON ABOUT OUR TRANSPORT PACKAGING
- 8 INITIATIVE THAT HAPPENED DOWN IN SAN JOSE LAST WEEK
- 9 THAT WAS VERY SUCCESSFUL AND TRIED TO GET SOME
- 10 INPUT FROM HIM. OTHER THAN THAT, EVERYTHING ELSE
- 11 IS UP TO SPEED.
- 12 COUPLE OF ANNOUNCEMENTS ON TODAY'S
- 13 AGENDA. ITEMS NO. 3, NO. 4, AND NO. 7 HAVE BEEN
- 14 PULLED, MAKING FOR A SHORT DAY. AND WE ARE -- WE
- 15 HAVE A 2136 ITEM THAT IS SCHEDULED FOR NO -- FOR
- 16 THE EIGHTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA. WE MAY TAKE THAT
- OUT OF ORDER AND PUT IT IN THE NINTH BECAUSE WE'VE
- 18 BEEN NOTIFIED THAT SOMEBODY FROM SENATOR THOMPSON'S
- 19 OFFICE WANTED TO SPEAK TO THE ITEM, AND THEY WERE
- TOLD PROBABLY ABOUT 10:30. AND WITH A LITTLE LUCK,
- 21 WE'LL BE OUT OF HERE BY 10:15. SO WE WILL HOLD
- 22 THIS TO THE LAST ITEM AND GIVE THEM AN OPPORTUNITY
- TO SPEAK TO THE ITEM IF THEY'RE HERE.

- 24 I'LL RELY ON TODD TO GIVE ME A HIGH
- 25 SIGN WHEN THAT ITEM COMES. ALL RIGHT.

```
MS. RICE, WOULD YOU LIKE TO MAKE A
 1
      REPORT ON YOUR DIVISION.
 2
              MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBER
 3
       RELIS. I'LL HAVE A VERY BRIEF REPORT THIS MORNING.
       THIS IS THE MONTH WHEN ORDINARILY I WOULD BE
 5
 6
       PROVIDING THE QUARTERLY UPDATE ON DELEGATED
       APPROVALS WITHIN THE DIVISION ON VARIOUS ISSUES,
 7
      MODIFIED PERMITS, ETC. WE'VE HAD SOME BREAKDOWNS
 8
 9
       IN OUR DATA GATHERING EFFORTS IN THE DIVISION, AND
10
       THUS I'LL HAVE A FULL REPORT FOR THE BOARD MEMBERS
11
       IN HARD COPY WITHIN THE WEEK AND WOULD PLAN ON
       INCLUDING A VERBAL UPDATE IN NEXT MONTH'S REPORT IF
12
      THAT'S ACCEPTABLE TO THE COMMITTEE. DON'T HAVE ALL
13
14
      THE PARTS AND PIECES WITH ME THIS MORNING.
                     SECONDLY, WANTED TO ADVISE MEMBERS
15
       AND AUDIENCE OF UPCOMING TIRE WORKSHOPS ON THE
16
       REGULATIONS. AS YOU RECALL, THE COMMITTEE AND THE
17
       POLICY COMMITTEE HAVE DIRECTED THAT STAFF LOOK AT
18
       REVISIONS TO OUR WASTE TIRE FACILITY REGULATIONS TO
19
      MORE ACCURATELY AND APPROPRIATELY ADDRESS YOUR
20
      GOALS FOR THOSE TYPES OF FACILITIES.
21
                    WORKSHOPS WILL BE NOTICED. I BELIEVE
22
```

THE MAILING IS GOING OUT TODAY OR TOMORROW FOR

23

- 24 THREE LOCATIONS AND WOULD ENCOURAGE ALL INTERESTED
- 25 PARTIES TO GET THOSE DATES ON THEIR CALENDAR AND

- 1 PLAN TO PARTICIPATE. NOVEMBER 18TH IN SACRAMENTO,
  2 DECEMBER 3D IN VISALIA, AND DECEMBER 9TH IN DIAMOND
- 3 BAR. AND AGAIN, THAT NOTICE WILL BE IN THE MAIL
- 4 WITH A COPY OF DRAFT REGULATORY LANGUAGE WITHIN THE
- 5 NEXT DAY OR SO.
- 6 ALSO VERY BRIEFLY, STAFF DID HOLD A
- 7 WORKSHOP YESTERDAY WITH A NUMBER OF INTERESTED
- 8 PARTIES TO HELP STAFF IN DRAFTING NEW DRAFT OF
- 9 PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO PLACE TRANSFER AND
- 10 PROCESSING OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES INTO THE
- 11 REGULATORY TIERS. I UNDERSTAND WE HAD A VERY
- 12 SUCCESSFUL WORKSHOP AND WANT TO THANK ALL THOSE WHO
- 13 PARTICIPATED IN THAT. WE HOPE TO BE BACK TO THIS
- 14 COMMITTEE NEXT MONTH, NOVEMBER, TO REQUEST THAT YOU
- 15 CONSIDER BEGINNING THE FORMAL RULEMAKING PROCESS,
- 16 THE OAL PROCESS, WITH THOSE REGULATIONS. SO YOU
- 17 WILL SEE THAT FOR NOVEMBER.
- 18 PURSUANT TO THIS COMMITTEE'S PRIOR
- 19 DIRECTION, THE INVENTORY OF FACILITIES THAT VIOLATE
- 20 STATE STANDARDS IS NOW READY TO BE PLACED ON THE
- 21 INTERNET. YOU SHOULD SEE THAT PLACEMENT WITHIN THE
- 22 NEXT WEEK OR SO AS WE PREPARE THE DOCUMENT FOR THE
- 23 INTERNET.

24			ΙA	ND LASTI	LY, T	THIS (	COM	MITTEE H	HAD	
25	REQUESTED	A	FEW	MONTHS	AGO	THAT	WE	PROVIDE	E PERIOD:	I

REPORTS ON USE BY LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF THE NEW CHIPPING AND GRINDING OPERATIONS REGULATIONS, 2 THE STORAGE STANDARD THAT THE BOARD ESTABLISHED FOR 3 THOSE OPERATIONS. OVERALL WE SEE A DECIDED INCREASE IN 5 6 INTEREST AND CONSIDERATION OF USING THE NEW REGULATIONS BY LEA'S AS EVIDENCED BY NUMEROUS 7 REQUESTS FOR COPIES OF THE REGULATIONS AND 8 9 QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW THEY WORK. WE'RE SEEKING TO IMPROVE OUR DATA 10 11 GATHERING ABOUT USE OF THE REGULATION IN TERMS OF ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS. IT'S NOT ALWAYS EASY TO 12 DISCERN WHEN YOU READ AN ENFORCEMENT LETTER OR 13 14 ORDER WHAT THE EXACT AUTHORITY IS THAT'S BEING CITED, AND OFTEN IT'S MULTIPLE AUTHORITY. SO THE 15 STORAGE STANDARD MAY JUST BE ONE OF NUMEROUS 16 AUTHORITIES CITED. SO WE'RE TRYING TO GET A LITTLE 17 BETTER HANDLE ON GIVING YOU THE KIND OF INFORMATION 18 YOU WANT. 19 WE ARE AWARE OF AT LEAST FOUR ACTIONS 20 OR PENDING ACTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE NEW 21 REGULATIONS INVOLVING VERMICOMPOSTING OR CHIPPING 22

AND GRINDING ACTIVITIES IN THE COUNTIES OF

23

- 24 RIVERSIDE, SAN BERNARDINO, ORANGE, AND FRESNO
- 25 COUNTIES.

I AM WONDERING AT THIS POINT WHETHER 1 YOU WOULD LIKE THESE REPORTS MONTHLY OR WHETHER I 2 COULD HAVE SOME LEEWAY TO COME BACK AS INFORMATION 3 DEVELOPS, WHETHER IT BE BIMONTHLY OR WHEN WE HAVE IT, OR IF YOU'D LIKE ME JUST TO CONTINUE TELLING 5 6 YOU WHAT I KNOW ON A MONTHLY BASIS. MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'D APPRECIATE, 7 UNTIL WE GET OUR REGULATIONS IN PLACE, A MONTHLY. 8 I WANTED TO ASK YOU. I SAW IN THE NEWSPAPER A 9 STORY OF ONE OF OUR LEGISLATORS -- WAS ON THE ONE 10 11 THAT FITZ FITZGERALD, MY STAFF, HAVE LOOKED AT AN OPERATION DOWN IN THE TIJUANA RIVER AREA. THERE 12 WAS A LARGE, ENORMOUS PILES OF ALLEGED VERMI-13 14 COMPOSTING OPERATION. AND A LEGISLATIVE MEMBER HAD BECOME INVOLVED IN THIS AND WAS EXPRESSING A GREAT 15 DEAL OF CONCERN ABOUT IT. 16 I DIDN'T SEE ANY REFERENCE TO 17 SPECIFIC ENFORCEMENT ACTION THERE, BUT THAT'S IN 18 THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY. AND IT'S AN AREA WHERE WE 19 HAVE HAD INCIDENTS AND PROBLEMS. SO I, FOR ONE, 20 WOULD LIKE A MONTHLY REPORT. 21 MS. RICE: I'LL BE HAPPY TO DO THAT AND TO 22

TRY TO GET A LITTLE BETTER LEVEL OF INFORMATION.

23

- 24 WE HAVE THE SAN DIEGO LEA IN THE AUDIENCE IF YOU'RE
- 25 INTERESTED IN INQUIRING ABOUT MORE PARTICULARS ON

- 1 THAT. I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH IT, PAUL.
- 2 MEMBER RELIS: DO YOU KNOW WHAT I'M
- 3 REFERRING TO?
- 4 MR. CALVERT: YEAH. IT'S DISNEY
- 5 ENTERPRISES.
- 6 KEN CALVERT WITH SAN DIEGO COUNTY
- 7 LEA. AND RICHARD DISNEY OPERATES A SITE IN THE
- 8 TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY. AND UNTIL YESTERDAY THEY HAD
- 9 BEEN SHUT DOWN FOR TWO WEEKS. THIS WAS AN ACTION
- 10 THAT HE IMPOSED ON HIMSELF, AND IT WAS ALSO AT THE
- 11 REQUEST OF THE LEASEHOLDER, WHICH HAPPENS TO BE THE
- 12 COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT.
- SO -- AND THE REAL ISSUE IS THAT
- 14 THERE'S MUCH MORE MATERIAL ON THE SITE THAN MR.
- 15 DISNEY IS ABLE TO PROCESS. HE'S RECEIVING MORE
- 16 MATERIAL THAN HE COULD PROCESS AS IT CAME IN. SO
- 17 THEY'VE ACCUMULATED QUITE A LARGE STOCKPILE.
- 18 MEMBER RELIS: HE HAD MADE IT --
- 19 THE NEWSPAPER STORY, OF COURSE, IS JUST A NEWSPAPER
- 20 STORY. SO I WOULD LIKE TO GET A TRUTH OF THIS
- 21 PARTICULAR ISSUE. IT ALLEGES THAT HE'S CLOSED DOWN
- 22 TEMPORARILY, BUT WAS TALKING ABOUT REOPENING, WAS
- 23 LOOKING FORWARD TO REOPENING SOON. AND IT SEEMS

- 24 SURPRISING TO ME THAT HE COULD REOPEN UNDER THE --
- 25 GIVEN THE SITUATION THAT EXISTS THERE. AND I

- 1 WONDERED WHAT THOUGHTS YOU HAD, IF ANY. I DON'T
- 2 KNOW WHO THE LEGISLATOR WAS WHO WAS --
- 3 MR. CALVERT: I THINK IT WAS CONGRESSWOMAN
- 4 DUCHENY.
- 5 MEMBER RELIS: YES.
- 6 MR. CALVERT: SHE HELD A PRESS CONFERENCE
- 7 AT THE SITE. I HAVEN'T HEARD ANY -- WHAT RESULTED
- 8 FROM THAT, BUT I DO KNOW THAT THE COUNTY HAS BEEN
- 9 TRYING TO ENFORCE THEIR LEASE AGREEMENT WITH MR.
- 10 DISNEY, SO THEY'VE BEEN NEGOTIATING WITH HIM. AND
- 11 I DON'T KNOW AT WHAT STAGE THAT IS.
- 12 THE LEA HAS TAKEN INDEPENDENT ACTION
- 13 TO ENFORCE THE EMERGENCY REGS. AND SO THAT IS ALSO
- 14 PENDING. BUT I'VE HEARD ANECDOTALLY THAT HE OPENED
- AGAIN YESTERDAY, BUT WE HAVEN'T SEEN THAT.
- 16 MEMBER RELIS: WELL, I WOULD DEFINITELY
- 17 LIKE THAT ONE CLOSELY FOLLOWED BECAUSE WE'VE
- 18 TRACKED IT FROM MY OFFICE. AND IT'S DIFFICULT FOR
- 19 ME TO COMPREHEND HOW AN OPERATION LIKE THAT, WITH
- 20 OUR EMERGENCY REGS IN EFFECT, COULD LEGITIMATELY
- 21 OPERATE. PERHAPS I'M, YOU KNOW, MISSING SOMETHING
- HERE. SO THAT WORRIES ME, FRANKLY, IF MORE
- 23 MATERIAL COMES IN AND EXISTING PROBLEM HAS NOT BEEN

- ADDRESSED, WHICH BY ALL MEASURE I DON'T THINK THE
- 25 PILES HAVE DISAPPEARED OR BEEN CONSUMED BY THE

- 1 SMALL NUMBER OF WORMS THAT ARE THERE.
- 2 MR. CALVERT: I THINK THERE IS ONE ISSUE
- 3 OF WHETHER OR NOT THE EMERGENCY REGS, ALTHOUGH WE
- 4 DO HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE CERTAIN STANDARDS,
- 5 SEPARATION, DISTANCE FROM THE PILES, AND CERTAIN
- 6 STORAGE REQUIREMENTS, IS WHETHER THE LEA HAS THE
- 7 AUTHORITY TO LITERALLY CLOSE DOWN THE FACILITY OR
- 8 REQUIRE HIM TO CEASE ACCEPTING MATERIAL. I'M NOT
- 9 SURE IF THAT'S THE CASE. WE MAY BE ABLE TO DO THAT
- 10 THROUGH THE LEASE AGREEMENT.
- 11 MEMBER RELIS: DOES COUNSEL HAVE ANY
- 12 RESPONSE TO THAT?
- MS. TOBIAS: WELL, WHY DO YOU THINK THAT
- 14 YOU COULDN'T CLOSE THEM DOWN, KEN? I THINK THE
- 15 COUNTY, NO. 1, COULD USE THEIR NUISANCE STATUTES
- 16 FIRST OF ALL. SECOND OF ALL, I THINK OUR STATUTE
- 17 WOULD ALLOW YOU TO ISSUE A CEASE AND DESIST IF YOU
- 18 THINK THERE'S AN IMMINENT DANGER. I CAN CERTAINLY
- 19 TALK TO YOU MORE ABOUT THAT AND I CAN TALK TO TOM
- 20 MONTGOMERY. BUT I'M NOT CLEAR THAT THERE WOULD BE
- 21 A PROBLEM WITH THAT.
- I DO WANT TO REMIND THE COMMITTEE
- 23 MEMBERS AND STAFF THAT THIS IS NOT AN AGENDA ITEM.

24 SO WHAT YOU CAN --

25 MEMBER RELIS: PURELY ANECDOTAL

- 1 INFORMATION ITEM. WE'RE NOT TAKING ANY ACTION
- 2 HERE.
- 3 MS. TOBIAS: SO WHAT YOU CAN DO IS
- 4 ACTUALLY ASK THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR TO GO AHEAD AND
- 5 INVESTIGATE OR TAKE ACTION OR WHATEVER YOU WANT,
- 6 BUT --
- 7 MS. RICE: WE'LL WORK WITH KEN TO GET MORE
- 8 COMPLETE INFORMATION FOR NEXT MONTH, AND WE'LL TAKE
- 9 YOUR GUIDANCE ON COMING BACK MONTHLY AND TRY TO BE
- 10 MORE COMPLETE IN THE INFORMATION THAT WE BRING
- 11 FORWARD.
- 12 MR. CALVERT: THE LEA IS VERY CONCERNED
- ABOUT THIS SITE, AND WE WILL BE CONTINUING TO TAKE
- 14 ENFORCEMENT ACTION AND WORKING WITH THE BOARD
- 15 STAFF.
- 16 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANKS, KEN.
- MS. RICE: THAT CONCLUDES MY REPORT.
- 18 CHAIRMAN JONES: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
- 19 SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA IS
- 20 CONSIDERATION OF A NEW SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT
- 21 FOR THE UNIVERSAL REFUSE REMOVAL, RECYCLING, AND
- 22 TRANSFER FACILITY IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY.
- MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND

- 24 MEMBERS. AMALIA FERNANDEZ OF STAFF WILL MAKE THE
- 25 PRESENTATION, ASSISTED BY KEN CALVERT AND REBECCA

LEFRENIERE OF THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY. 1 MS. FERNANDEZ: GOOD MORNING. THE 2 PROPOSED PROJECT IS FOR THE OPERATION OF A MRF 3 TRANSFER STATION IN THE CITY OF EL CAJON IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY. UNIVERSAL REFUSE REMOVAL, A 5 6 SUBSIDIARY OF WASTE MANAGEMENT, WILL OPERATE THE FACILITY ON LAND OWNED BY THE CITY OF EL CAJON. 7 8 THE FACILITY WILL OPERATE 24 HOURS A 9 DAY AND WILL HANDLE UP TO A THOUSAND TONS PER DAY. 10 THE FACILITY WILL BE BUILT IN TWO PHASES. 11 PREVIOUSLY THIS SITE WAS OPERATED UNDER A NOTIFICATION TIER AS A SEALED CONTAINER 12 OPERATION. THE OPERATOR NOW PROPOSES TO EXPAND THE 13 14 OPERATIONS TO INCLUDE THE TRANSFER STATION AND A MRF. 15 WASTE WILL BE DELIVERED IN SEALED 16 CONTAINERS OR REFUSE COLLECTION TRUCKS. SEALED 17 CONTAINERS WILL BE UNLOADED OUTSIDE, AND REFUSE 18 WILL BE MOVED INSIDE THE BUILDING WITH A YARD MULE 19 AND UNLOADED. COLLECTION TRUCKS WILL BACK INTO THE 20 BUILDING AND UNLOAD DIRECTLY ONTO THE TIPPING 21 22 FLOOR.

23

PHASE II OF THE OPERATION WILL EXPAND

- THE TRANSFER BUILDING TO ACCOMMODATE THE MRF.
- THE CITY OF EL CAJON RECENTLY AMENDED

- 1 THEIR NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT, ALSO KNOWN AS
- THE NDFE. THE AMENDED NDFE WILL BE PRESENTED AT
- 3 THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 21ST.
- 4 AT THIS TIME THE ITEM FOR
- 5 CONSIDERATION OF THE AMENDED NDFE IS ON THE
- 6 PLANNING COMMITTEE'S CONSENT CALENDAR. WE
- 7 RECOMMEND CONCURRENCE IN THE ISSUANCE OF THE PERMIT
- 8 AND THAT THIS ITEM BE PLACED ON THE BOARD'S CONSENT
- 9 CALENDAR PENDING APPROVAL OF THE NDFE.
- 10 IF THE NDFE IS NOT APPROVED BY THE
- BOARD'S PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THE 21ST, WE WILL ASK
- 12 THAT THIS ITEM BE PULLED FROM THE BOARD'S CONSENT
- 13 AGENDA ON THE 22D.
- 14 REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OPERATOR ARE
- 15 PRESENT SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.
- 16 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I DO HAVE A
- 17 QUESTION OF CLARIFICATION.
- 18 CHAIRMAN JONES: SURE.
- 19 MEMBER RELIS: NO ISSUE WITH THE PROJECT.
- 20 I JUST HAVE ON THE PERMIT. I WANTED TO ASK THE
- 21 APPLICANT, THE OPERATOR, IN THE SCHEMATIC FOR THE
- 22 PROPOSED RECYCLING PORTION OF THE TRANSFER
- 23 FACILITY, THERE'S -- IT'S A VERY GENERALIZED

- 24 SCHEMATIC. AND I WAS JUST THINKING, HERE WE ARE.
- WE'RE ABOUT 2.3 YEARS FROM THE 50-PERCENT

- 1 ACCOUNTABILITY TIME FRAME. AND I'M WONDERING WHAT
- 2 YOUR THOUGHTS ARE ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THAT
- 3 PHASE OF YOUR EFFORT THERE.
- 4 MR. NORTHROP: MY NAME IS TIM NORTHROP
- 5 WITH UNIVERSAL REFUSE REMOVAL.
- 6 OUR INTENT HERE IS -- YOU SEE EL
- 7 CAJON RIGHT NOW IS AT 34 PERCENT. AND THE WAY THAT
- 8 WE'RE VIEWING THIS IS AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO GET US
- 9 OVER THE 50 PERCENT FOR THE YEAR 2000, ALONG WITH
- 10 SOME OTHER PROGRAMS IN THE CITY THAT WE'RE PLANNING
- 11 TO DO AS A HAULER, WHICH IS THE INCREASED
- 12 COLLECTION OF SOURCE SEPARATED GREEN WASTE AND
- 13 EXPANSION INTO MULTI-FAMILY RECYCLING. BUT THIS --
- 14 WE DON'T HAVE THIS SLATED TO START CONSTRUCTION,
- YOU KNOW, THIS YEAR. MAYBE NEXT YEAR OR IT MAY BE
- 16 1999. IT REALLY DEPENDS.
- 17 WE'RE VIEWING IT MORE AS AN
- 18 OPPORTUNITY. WHEN WE DID THIS PERMIT, WE WANTED TO
- 19 MAKE SURE THAT WE HAD THAT OPPORTUNITY INCLUDED IN
- THE PERMIT SO WHEN WE WANTED TO DO IT, WE COULD
- 21 REACT QUICKLY. THIS IS A VERY QUICK TIME FRAME ON
- 22 THIS TYPE OF THING. THIS BUILDING IS ALREADY
- 23 EXISTING.

24 MEMBER RELIS: SO YOU COULD INSTALL
25 EQUIPMENT AND IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM RATHER QUICKLY?

- 1 MR. NORTHROP: JUST A MATTER OF A FEW
- 2 MONTHS.
- 3 MEMBER RELIS: OKAY. THAT'S ALL I WANTED,
- 4 JUST AN IDEA OF WHAT YOUR PLANS WERE OR STATUS.
- 5 CHAIRMAN JONES: ONE QUESTION. THE
- 6 OPERATOR IS AWARE THAT IF THE NDFE IS NOT APPROVED,
- 7 THEN THE PERMIT DOESN'T GO FORWARD, RIGHT?
- 8 MR. NORTHROP: WE'RE AWARE OF THAT.
- 9 CHAIRMAN JONES: I JUST WANTED TO MAKE
- 10 SURE.
- 11 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, IF THERE'S
- 12 NOBODY WISHING TO SPEAK, I WILL MOVE CONSIDERATION
- OF THE UNIVERSAL REFUSE REMOVAL, RECYCLING, AND
- 14 TRANSFER FACILITY, SAN DIEGO COUNTY.
- 15 CHAIRMAN JONES: AND I WILL SECOND THAT.
- ARE WE GOING TO ADD ON THERE, MR. RELIS, THAT IT'S
- 17 PENDING THE APPROVAL OF THE NDFE?
- 18 MEMBER RELIS: YES. YES. STATED IN THE
- 19 STAFF REPORT, YES.
- 20 CHAIRMAN JONES: ALL RIGHT. I WILL
- 21 SECOND. MIGHT AS WELL TAKE A ROLL. KEEP IT ALL
- 22 LEGAL.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.

MEMBER RELIS: AYE.

25 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.

17

```
CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE.
 1
                  MR. RELIS, CAN WE PUT THIS ON
 2
 3
   CONSENT?
             MEMBER RELIS: YES.
             CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY
 5
 6
      MUCH.
 7
                   ITEMS 3 AND 4 BEING PULLED, ITEM 5 IS
 8
     CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY
 9
    PERMIT FOR MIDVALLEY LANDFILL IN SAN BERNARDINO
10 COUNTY.
11
             MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
      MEMBERS. TADESE GEBRE-HAWARIAT WITH STAFF WILL
12
     MAKE THE PRESENTATION FOR THIS ITEM AND ITEM 6,
13
14
     ASSISTED ON BOTH ITEMS BY MATT SLOWIK WITH THE
15 LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.
               MR. GEBRE-HAWARIAT: GOOD MORNING. THE
16
     OWNER AND OPERATORS OF THE MIDVALLEY SANITARY
17
      LANDFILL IS THE SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY WASTE SYSTEMS
18
      DIVISION. UNDER CONTRACT, THE DAY-TO-DAY LANDFILL
19
      OPERATIONS IS CARRIED OUT BY NORCAL SAN BERNARDINO
20
      INC.
21
22
                  THE PROPOSED PERMIT IS TO ALLOW THE
```

23 FOLLOWING: CHANGE IN THE LANDFILL CLOSURE PERIOD

- FROM APRIL 1997 TO SEPTEMBER YEAR 2004. AND ALSO,
- THE PERMIT IS TO ALLOW THE USE OF GREEN WASTE

MATERIAL AS ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER ON A PERMANENT 2 BASIS. AT THE TIME THIS ITEM WAS PREPARED, 3 STAFF REVIEW OF THE PERMIT APPLICATION PACKAGE HAD NOT BEEN COMPLETED IN THAT THE COMMITTEE ITEM DID 5 6 NOT INCLUDE STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE PROPOSED PERMIT. BUT NOW I BELIEVE THAT ATTACHMENT 4, WHICH 7 IS THE RESOLUTION, HAS BEEN DISTRIBUTED TO THE 8 9 COMMITTEE MEMBERS. SUBSEQUENT TO THE PREPARATION AND 10 11 SUBMITTAL OF THE AGENDA ITEM, ON OCTOBER 8, 1997, STAFF OF THE BOARD'S ENFORCEMENT BRANCH CONDUCTED 12 AN INSPECTION OF THE LANDFILL AND OBSERVED 13 14 VIOLATIONS OF STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS. SPECIFICALLY THE VIOLATION WAS THAT 15 OF INADEQUATE COVER AT THE EDGE OF THE WORKING FACE 16 WHERE THE GREEN WASTE MATERIAL, ALTERNATIVE DAILY 17 COVER, WAS NOT TO THE REQUIRED DEPTH AND WASTE WAS 18 VISIBLE. ON SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1997, AND AGAIN 19 ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 14TH, THE LEA CONDUCTED 20 FOLLOW-UP INSPECTIONS AT THE SITE AND OBSERVED THAT 21 THE COVER VIOLATION WAS CORRECTED AND THAT THE 22

OPERATIONS OF THE LANDFILL WERE IN COMPLIANCE WITH

23

- THE STATE STANDARDS.
- NOW THE LEA AND BOARD STAFF HAVE

- 1 DETERMINED THAT ALL THE REQUIRED FINDINGS HAVE BEEN
- 2 MADE. ONE, THAT THE MIDVALLEY SANITARY LANDFILL IS
- 3 CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF
- 4 RIALTO AND THAT THE OPERATIONS ARE COMPATIBLE WITH
- 5 THE SURROUNDING LAND USES; TWO, THAT THE LANDFILL
- 6 IS IDENTIFIED IN THE COUNTY SITING ELEMENT, WHICH
- 7 HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE BOARD; THREE, THAT CEQA
- 8 HAS BEEN COMPLIED WITH.
- 9 STAFF REVIEWED THE PROPOSED PERMIT
- 10 AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION AND HAVE FOUND THEM TO
- 11 BE ACCEPTABLE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD.
- 12 IN CONCLUSION, STAFF RECOMMEND THAT
- 13 THE BOARD ADOPT SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT
- 14 DECISION NO. 97-481, CONCURRING IN THE ISSUANCE OF
- 15 SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT NO. 36-AA-0055. THIS
- 16 CONCLUDES STAFF PRESENTATION.
- 17 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, NO PROBLEM AGAIN
- 18 WITH THE PERMIT. QUESTION I'D LIKE TO DIRECT TO
- MR. SWEETSER, WHO'S HERE FROM NORCAL.
- 20 ON THE ADC ISSUE, I NOTE THAT THIS
- 21 PERMIT WILL GIVE YOU ONGOING APPROVAL TO USE ADC,
- 22 GREEN MATERIAL, AT A MINIMUM COMPACTED DEPTH OF 6
- 23 INCHES. AND I'D JUST LIKE TO GET AN IDEA ABOUT --

- I BELIEVE IN MY BRIEFING THE USE WAS GOING TO BE
- SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 2 AND 300 TONS PER DAY WAS THE

ESTIMATED USE. DOES THIS MEAN THAT THE -- THERE ARE A NUMBER OF JURISDICTIONS THAT ARE NOW 2 COLLECTING CLEAN GREEN, AND THEN THEY'RE OBVIOUSLY 3 USING THIS AS PART OF THEIR DIVERSION PROGRAM. WHAT'S YOUR ASSESSMENT AT THIS POINT 5 6 OF YOUR ABILITY TO USE GREEN AS ADC IN TERMS OF THE AMOUNT AVAILABLE? 7 MR. SWEETSER: LARRY SWEETSER, DIRECTOR OF 8 9 REGULATORY AFFAIRS FOR NORCAL WASTE SYSTEMS. WE'RE THE CONTRACT OPERATOR ON THE SITE. 10 11 WE'VE LIMITED OUR USE TO LESS THAN 50 PERCENT RATIO, SO WE'RE NOT CORNERING THE MARKET BY 12 ANY MEANS ON WHAT'S GOING ON THERE. I DON'T HAVE A 13 14 GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF ALL THE DIFFERENT COMPOST ACTIVITIES OR GREEN WASTE COLLECTION GOING ON SINCE 15 WE ONLY OPERATE THE LANDFILLS. MOST OF OUR GREEN 16 WASTE COMING FROM ONE SUPPLIER, AND WE'RE USING AS 17 MUCH WE CAN. I'M SURE THEY WOULD LIKE US TO USE 18 MORE, BUT AT THIS POINT WE'RE LIMITING WHAT OUR 19 20 USAGE IS. WE'VE -- RIGHT NOW OUR AVERAGE IS 21 LESS THAN 250 TONS PER DAY. AND SO WE DON'T EXPECT 22

THAT TO INCREASE OR DECREASE ANY SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT

23

24 IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

25 MEMBER RELIS: AS YOU LOOK TOWARDS --

- 1 SINCE YOU'RE IMPLEMENTING ARM FOR SO MUCH OF THAT
- 2 AREA, I'D LIKE TO OFFER OUR ASSISTANCE IN
- 3 IDENTIFYING OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOU VIS-A-VIS
- 4 THE DIVERSION SIDE AND THE GREEN WASTE. AND WE
- 5 FEEL THE MARKET HAS COME A LONG WAY. WE'RE NOT
- 6 WHERE WE WERE THREE, FOUR YEARS AGO. AND IF YOU
- 7 DON'T ALREADY HAVE IDENTIFIED, WHICH I'M SURE YOU
- 8 HAVE, WE CERTAINLY HAVE A DEEPER INFORMATION BANK
- 9 OF POSSIBILITIES FOR YOU TO CONSIDER.
- 10 MR. SWEETSER: I THINK WE WOULD APPRECIATE
- 11 THAT CONSIDERATION. I WILL GET BACK TO THE COUNTY
- 12 AND RELAY THAT. WE CAN ALSO OFFER TO PULL TOGETHER
- 13 THE PEOPLE THAT ARE INVOLVED IN THE COLLECTION OF
- 14 THE GREEN WASTE AND THE COMPOST AND FIND OUT
- 15 EXACTLY WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THE QUANTITIES AND
- 16 HOW MUCH MORE POTENTIAL IS OUT THERE AND WHAT THE
- 17 ROADBLOCKS ARE FOR DIVERSION.
- 18 MEMBER RELIS: BECAUSE WE HAVE ALSO OUR UC
- 19 RIVERSIDE GROUP THAT WE'RE UNDER CONTRACT WITH, WHO
- 20 ARE VERY ACTIVE WITH US IN THIS ISSUE OF
- 21 IDENTIFYING AND DEVELOPING MARKETS. AND SO I'D
- LIKE TO TAKE YOU UP ON THAT.
- MR. SWEETSER: WE WILL DEFINITELY DO THAT,

- 24 AND I WILL GET THE CALL OUT TODAY.
- 25 MEMBER RELIS: THANK YOU.

```
CHAIRMAN JONES: I'LL EITHER ENTERTAIN A
 1
   MOTION OR MAKE A MOTION TO ACCEPT PERMIT DECISION
 3 NO. 97-481.
             MEMBER RELIS: SECOND.
             THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
 5
 6
             MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
              THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
 7
             CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE.
 8
9
                   MR. RELIS, DO YOU MIND IF WE PUT THIS
10
    ON CONSENT?
11
             MEMBER RELIS: THAT WOULD BE FINE.
              CHAIRMAN JONES: NEXT ITEM FOR THE SAME
12
     COUNTY, CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE
13
14
      FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE CALIFORNIA STREET SANITARY
     LANDFILL IN SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY.
15
               MR. GEBRE-HAWARIAT: THE OWNER AND
16
      OPERATOR OF THE CALIFORNIA STREET SANITARY LANDFILL
17
      IS THE CITY OF REDLANDS MUNICIPAL UTILITIES
18
      DEPARTMENT. AND MR. GARY PHELPS IS THE DIRECTOR.
19
                   THE PROPOSED PERMIT IS TO ALLOW THE
20
     FOLLOWING: AN INCREASE OF 20 FEET IN THE ELEVATION
21
OF THE WEST SIDE OF THE LANDFILL TO A PERMITTED
```

23 MAXIMUM OF 1238 FEET ABOVE MEAN SEA LEVEL. AND

- 24 THIS WOULD ALLOW FOR AN INCREASE IN THE LANDFILL
- DESIGN CAPACITY FROM 4 TO 4.5 TO 6 MILLION CUBIC

- 1 YARDS. AND ON THE BASIS OF THE INCREASED CAPACITY,
- THE PERMIT ALLOWS THE CHANGE IN THE ESTIMATED
- 3 CLOSURE PERIOD FOR THE LANDFILL FROM THE YEAR 2000
- 4 TO SEPTEMBER OF THE YEAR 2007.
- 5 THE PERMIT IS ALSO TO ALLOW THE USE
- 6 OF A GEOSYNTHETIC TOP MATERIAL AS ALTERNATIVE DAILY
- 7 COVER ON A PERMANENT BASIS.
- 8 AT THE TIME THE ITEM WAS PREPARED,
- 9 STAFF REVIEW OF THE PERMIT APPLICATION PACKAGE HAD
- 10 NOT BEEN COMPLETED IN THAT THE COMMITTEE ITEM
- 11 DIDN'T INCLUDE STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE PROPOSED
- 12 PERMIT. BUT I BELIEVE, AGAIN, THE ATTACHMENT 4 HAS
- 13 BEEN DISTRIBUTED.
- 14 THE LEA AND BOARD STAFF HAVE
- 15 DETERMINED THAT ALL THE REQUIRED FINDINGS HAVE BEEN
- 16 MADE. ONE, THAT THE CITY OF REDLANDS DEPARTMENT OF
- 17 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DETERMINED THAT THE LANDFILL
- 18 AND THE PROPOSED EXPANSION ARE CONSISTENT WITH CITY
- 19 GENERAL PLAN AND ARE ALSO COMPATIBLE WITH THE
- 20 SURROUNDING LAND USE; TWO, THAT THE LANDFILL IS
- 21 IDENTIFIED IN THE COUNTY SITING ELEMENT, WHICH HAS
- 22 BEEN APPROVED BY THE BOARD; AND, THREE, THAT CEQA
- 23 HAS BEEN COMPLIED WITH; NO. 4, THE OPERATIONS OF

- 24 THE LANDFILL ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATE MINIMUM
- 25 STANDARDS.

STAFF HAVE REVIEWED THE PROPOSED 1 PERMIT AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION AND HAVE FOUND 2 THEM TO BE ACCEPTABLE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE 3 BOARD. AND IN CONCLUSION, STAFF RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD ADOPT SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT DECISION 5 6 NO. 97-482, CONCURRING IN THE ISSUANCE OF SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT NO. 36-AA-0017. 7 THE OPERATOR, MS. VALERIE SHATYNSKI, 8 9 IS HERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT THE COMMITTEE 10 MEMBERS MAY HAVE. AND THIS CONCLUDES MY REPORT. 11 CHAIRMAN JONES: I HAVE ONE. AND MAYBE THE LEA CAN ANSWER IT. WE DON'T HAVE TO HAVE THE 12 OPERATOR. 13 14 THE 20-FOOT ELEVATION, IS THAT GOING TO IMPACT THE SLOPE DESIGN OR ANYTHING AS PART OF 15 OUR CLOSURE-POSTCLOSURE DOCUMENTATION? ARE YOU 16 GOING TO FOLLOW THE SAME PERCENTAGES --17 MR. SLOWIK: THE 20-FOOT ELEVATION 18 INCREASE IS ONLY ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE LANDFILL, 19 AND THOSE SLOPES WOULD REMAIN CONSISTENT UP TO THE 20 21 TOP. CHAIRMAN JONES: YOU DIDN'T HAVE TO 22 23 REDESIGN.

24	MR. SLOWIK: NO.
25	CHAIRMAN JONES: I JUST DIDN'T KNOW WHAT
	25

- 1 THE IMPACT OF THAT 20 FEET WOULD DO TO YOUR CLOSURE
- 2 PLAN.
- MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'LL MOVE PERMIT
- 4 DECISION 97-482.
- 5 CHAIRMAN JONES: I WILL SECOND.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 7 MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 8 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 9 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE.
- MR. RELIS, IS IT OKAY IF WE PUT THIS
- 11 ON CONSENT?
- 12 MEMBER RELIS: SURE.
- 13 CHAIRMAN JONES: THIS WILL GO ON CONSENT.
- 14 SEVEN BEING PULLED.
- TODD, ARE WE OKAY TO GO ON? ALL
- 16 RIGHT. OUR AGENDA ITEM NO. 8 IS CONSIDERATION OF A
- 17 NEW SITE FOR THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL AND
- 18 CODISPOSAL SITE CLEANUP PROGRAM UNDER AB 2136.
- 19 MS. RICE: THANK YOU. TODD THALHEIMER
- 20 WILL MAKE THE PRESENTATION FOR STAFF.
- MR. THALHEIMER: MORNING, CHAIRMAN,
- 22 MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. ON SEPTEMBER 2D HUMBOLDT
- 23 COUNTY HEALTH OFFICER DECLARED A PUBLIC EMERGENCY

- ON THE SOUTH SPIT ALONG HUMBOLDT BAY DUE TO SEVERAL
- 25 CONFIRMED CASES OF SHIGELLA. HUMBOLDT COUNTY LEA

REQUESTED BOARD STAFF TO CONDUCT A SITE VISIT ON 1 SEPTEMBER 10TH TO DETERMINE IF THE SITE COULD 2 QUALIFY FOR CLEANUP UNDER THE 2136 PROGRAM. THE 3 PROPOSED FUNDING WOULD BE AN LEA GRANT. I'VE REVIEWED THE PACKAGE AND 5 6 RECOMMEND APPROVING AN LEA GRANT FOR \$170,000. MR. DENNIS KALSON, DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, 7 AND KEVIN METCALF, HUMBOLDT COUNTY LEA, AND A 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE FROM SENATOR THOMPSON'S OFFICE ARE 10 HERE TO SPEAK AND ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE 11 ON THIS PACKAGE. I HAVE ABOUT A 30-SECOND CLIP. JUST 12 GIVE ME A MINUTE TO TURN IT ON TO GIVE YOU JUST A 13 14 QUICK OVERVIEW OF THE SITE. (VIDEO WAS THEN PLAYED.) 15 MR. THALHEIMER: I BELIEVE KEVIN METCALF 16 TOOK THIS VIDEO FROM A SHERIFF'S HELICOPTER JUST TO 17 KIND OF GIVE YOU AN OVERVIEW OF SOME OF THE 18 ENCAMPMENTS THAT ARE OUT THERE. UNFORTUNATELY I 19 HAVE NO IDEA WHERE THE TAPE IS NOW. 20 THE PROCESS FROM WHERE THEY CAMP, 21 THEY WOULD DISPOSE OF THEIR TRASH AND REFUSE IN ONE 22

AREA AND MOVE TO THE NEXT. AT THIS PARTICULAR

23

- TIME, I THINK THERE WAS, WHAT, 200 PEOPLE OR 2 TO
- 300 PEOPLE ON THE SOUTH SPIT WHEN THEY FIRST

```
1
       STARTED.
 2
                   THAT CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. I
       BELIEVE MR. DENNIS KALSON WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ON
 3
       BEHALF OF THE PROJECT.
              MR. KALSON: THANK YOU. I'M DENNIS
 5
 6
       KALSON, DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH WITH
       HUMBOLDT COUNTY, REPRESENTING BOTH THE COUNTY AND
 7
 8
       THE LEA THIS MORNING.
 9
                    I, FIRST OF ALL, WOULD LIKE TO
10
       COMMEND THE BOARD AND THE BOARD STAFF, PARTICULARLY
11
      MARGE ROUCH AND TODD THALHEIMER, FOR THEIR
       TREMENDOUS SUPPORT AND EXCELLENT WORK IN HELPING US
12
      PUT TOGETHER A PIECE OF A SOLUTION OF A VERY
13
14
       COMPLEX PROBLEM ON THE SOUTH SPIT OF HUMBOLDT BAY.
                    AS YOU GOT JUST A GLIMPSE OF IN THIS
15
       LITTLE CLIP THAT TODD PLAYED, THE SPIT IS A FOUR-
16
       AND-A-HALF-MILE LONG STRETCH OF SAND, ESSENTIALLY
17
       UNMANAGED LAND, TWO OR THREE PROPERTY OWNERS. AND
18
       BECAUSE IT'S UNMANAGED HAS BEEN CONVERTED OVER THE
19
      PAST TEN YEARS FROM WHAT WAS QUITE A SCENIC,
20
      PRISTINE TOURIST AREA OF HUMBOLDT COUNTY INTO A
21
       SHANTY TOWN WITH A POPULATION THAT LIVED THERE OVER
22
```

THE LAST TEN YEARS THAT VARIED BETWEEN A HUNDRED

23

24 AND 300 PEOPLE AT ANY TIME.

THERE'S ABSOLUTELY NO SEWAGE

DISPOSAL, NO RUNNING WATER, NO UTILITIES, SERVICES, 1 OR ANY OTHER FACILITIES SERVING THIS POPULATION, 2 LET ALONE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT. SO TEN YEARS OF 3 CONCENTRATED LIVING OF A REAL VERY POOR ISOLATED SEGMENT OF OUR POPULATION HAS GENERATED TEN YEARS 5 WORTH OF LIVING DEBRIS, TRAILERS, SHANTIES, TENTS, 6 CAMPERS THAT HAVE BEEN OCCUPIED AND VACATED AND 7 8 ABANDONED, LITTER THE WHOLE STRETCH. 9 WE'RE HERE THIS MORNING AND WE'VE 10 BEEN PUTTING TOGETHER A PROPOSAL FOR YOUR 11 CONSIDERATION TO ASK FOR ASSISTANCE IN SOLVING THAT PORTION OF THIS PROBLEM THAT WE COULD, I THINK, IN 12 NO OTHER WAY SOLVE BECAUSE OF CONFUSION OVER LAND 13 14 OWNERSHIP. AND BECAUSE A COUPLE OF PUBLIC ENTITIES OWN SOME OF THE LAND ON THE SPIT, IT'S REALLY HARD 15 FOR US TO SOLVE THE CLEANUP PROBLEM IN ANY OTHER 16 WAY OTHER THAN ASKING FOR ASSISTANCE FROM YOUR 17 18 BOARD. I SHOULD TELL YOU THAT OUR HEALTH 19 OFFICER HAS TAKEN A BOLD AND DRAMATIC STEP BY 20 ORDERING RELOCATION OR EVACUATION OF THE SPIT, 21 WHICH MEANS UPSETTING THE LIVES OF THE 2 TO 300 22

PEOPLE WHO LIVE THERE. BUT ACTUALLY AT THE SAME

23

- 24 TIME, WE'RE OFFERING -- THE COUNTY IS OFFERING
- 25 HOUSING ASSISTANCE SERVICES. WE'VE PUT TIRES ON

- 1 VEHICLES, WE'VE PAID INSURANCE SO THAT PEOPLE CAN
- 2 REGISTER THEIR VEHICLES, WE HAVE RELOCATED A
- 3 HUNDRED TWENTY DOGS SO FAR THAT HAVE BEEN RUNNING
- 4 LOOSE ON THE SPIT.
- 5 THIS IS NO -- BY NO WAY -- BY NO
- 6 MEANS A FORM OF UNHUMANE TREATMENT OF THIS
- 7 POPULATION. AS THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIRECTOR,
- 8 I'M LEFT WITH THE PROBLEM OF CLEANUP. AND AGAIN,
- 9 THAT'S WHY I'M HERE THIS MORNING.
- 10 I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS
- ON WHERE WE'RE AT IN TERMS OF THAT RELOCATION
- 12 EFFORT. RIGHT NOW WE'RE RESTRAINED BY A
- 13 RESTRAINING ORDER FROM THE JUDGE. WE THINK THAT
- 14 WILL BE LIFTED TODAY BY THE SUPERIOR COURT. AND WE
- 15 INTEND TO ENFORCE THE EVACUATION DEADLINE WITHIN 48
- 16 HOURS. SO VERY SOON, AS EARLY AS NEXT WEEK, WE
- 17 SHOULD HAVE MOST ALL OF THE POPULATION, EXCEPT FOR
- ONE OR TWO VERY RECALCITRANT PEOPLE, OFF OF THE
- 19 SPIT AND WILL BE PRIMING THE AREA THEN FOR SETTING
- 20 THE STAGE FOR THE CLEANUP OPERATION WHICH IS NEXT.
- 21 THE WHOLE EFFORT WILL PREPARE THIS
- 22 LAND FOR SANE, INTELLIGENT MANAGEMENT IN THE
- 23 FUTURE. AND WE'RE ALSO WORKING ON PLANS. WE'VE

- 24 INSTALLED A GATE TO CONTROL ACCESS, AND WORKING ON
- 25 A DETAILED PLAN IN CONCERT WITH THE CALIFORNIA

- 1 COASTAL CONSERVANCY AND A COUPLE OF OTHER STATE
- 2 ORGANIZATIONS TO MANAGE THE LAND AND PREVENT THIS
- 3 SORT OF THING FROM HAPPENING AGAIN IN OUR COUNTY.
- 4 SO IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS, I'D BE HAPPY TO
- 5 RESPOND.
- 6 CHAIRMAN JONES: I DON'T HAVE ANY
- 7 QUESTIONS. I WANT TO COMMEND YOUR COURAGE. HAVING
- 8 BEEN AN OPERATOR OR AN OVERSEER OF CITY GARBAGE IN
- 9 EUREKA IN A PAST LIFE, I HAD ABOUT 30 OF THOSE
- 10 PEOPLE ACROSS THE STREET FROM OUR FACILITY ABOUT
- 11 TEN YEARS AGO. SO I'M SURE SOME OF THEM, WHEN WE
- 12 GOT THEM OFF OF THAT PROPERTY, PROBABLY ENDED UP ON
- 13 THIS PROPERTY, AND IT WAS A DISASTER WAITING TO
- 14 HAPPEN. AND I COMMEND YOUR COURAGE. I KNOW IT'S A
- 15 TOUGH ONE TO DO.
- 16 MR. KALSON: I THINK I REMEMBER THAT
- 17 SITUATION.
- 18 CHAIRMAN JONES: GOT KIND OF UGLY. I TOLD
- 19 MY MANAGER TO CLEAN IT UP, AND HE TOOK A BULLDOZER
- OUT THERE.
- 21 MR. KALSON: IT IS CONTROVERSIAL. OF
- 22 COURSE, WE DO WANT -- WE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT
- 23 GETTING PEOPLE INTO SAFE, SANITARY HOUSING. THAT'S

OUR GOAL.

25 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, JUST SOUNDS LIKE

- 1 THE TYPE OF USE THESE FUNDS WERE SET ASIDE FOR, AND
- 2 IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU'VE TAKEN ALL THE MEASURES YOU
- 3 CAN TO DO THIS IN, AS YOU PUT IT, HUMAN A WAY AS
- 4 POSSIBLE BY CREATING A SAFE ALTERNATIVE FOR PEOPLE
- 5 TO BE IN, BUT CLEARLY THIS IS A MAJOR HEALTH
- 6 PROBLEM. IT HAS TO BE ADDRESSED, AND THAT'S ONE OF
- 7 OUR PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES, SO FULLY SUPPORTIVE
- 8 OF IT.
- 9 CHAIRMAN JONES: ABSOLUTELY.
- 10 MR. KALSON: I CAN SPEAK ON BEHALF OF OUR
- 11 ENTIRE COUNTY, AT LEAST THOSE WHO AREN'T OPPOSED TO
- 12 THIS ACTION, THAT WE REALLY DO APPRECIATE THIS TYPE
- OF SUPPORT AND AGREE WITH YOUR FEELINGS, THAT IT'S
- 14 A GREAT USE OF THESE CLEANUP FUNDS. ALSO THANKS
- 15 AGAIN TO MARGE AND TODD. THIS IS PROBABLY THE
- 16 FASTEST PIECE OF -- THE FASTEST APPLICATION, I
- 17 THINK, THAT WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO PROCESS THROUGH THIS
- 18 BOARD.
- 19 CHAIRMAN JONES: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU
- VERY MUCH. WE'VE GOT MS. RUTH COLEMAN. I DON'T
- 21 KNOW IF SHE WANTS TO SPEAK. I'D LIKE TO INVITE HER
- TO SPEAK FROM SENATOR THOMPSON'S OFFICE.
- MS. COLEMAN: HI. I'M RUTH COLEMAN

- 24 REPRESENTING SENATOR THOMPSON. THIS ACQUISITION OF
- THE SOUTH SPIT IS A VERY HIGH PRIORITY OF SENATOR

- 1 THOMPSON. HE AUTHORED A BILL A YEAR AGO THAT
- 2 APPROPRIATED A HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS TO THE
- 3 COASTAL CONSERVANCY TO DO A MANAGEMENT PLAN. AND
- 4 THE BILL ALSO SPECIFIED LEGISLATIVE INTENT TO
- 5 PURCHASE THIS PROPERTY ONCE THE PROPERTY HAS BEEN
- 6 CLEANED.
- 7 SO WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE
- 8 TODAY IS REALLY SORT OF A STEP TOWARDS THAT
- 9 LONG-TERM GOAL, AND THIS IS ONE OF THOMPSON'S
- 10 HIGHEST PRIORITIES FOR HIS DISTRICT. AND SO WE
- 11 REALLY APPRECIATE WHAT YOU GUYS ARE DOING. THANK
- 12 YOU.
- 13 CHAIRMAN JONES: THANK YOU. ANYBODY?
- 14 OKAY.
- 15 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'LL BE HAPPY TO
- 16 MOVE APPROVAL OF THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL AND
- 17 CODISPOSAL SITE CLEANUP OF THE SOUTH SPIT ILLEGAL
- 18 DISPOSAL SITE, HUMBOLDT COUNTY.
- 19 CHAIRMAN JONES: AND I SECOND THAT.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES.
- 23 CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE.

24 MR. RELIS, CAN WE PUT THIS ON THE 25 CONSENT CALENDAR, SAVE THE FOLKS A TRIP. ALL

- 1 RIGHT. THANKS. GOOD JOB, YOU GUYS.
- OKAY. ITEM AGENDA ITEM NO. 9, A
- 3 DISCUSSION OF DRAFT REGULATIONS TO ESTABLISH FILING
- 4 DATES FOR BOARD ACTION ON PROPOSED SOLID WASTE
- 5 FACILITIES PERMITS.
- 6 MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. DON
- 7 DIER WILL MAKE A BRIEF PRESENTATION TO OPEN YOUR
- 8 DISCUSSION OF THIS ITEM.
- 9 MR. DIER: VERY BRIEF. GOOD MORNING.
- 10 THIS IS AN INFORMATION ITEM THE COMMITTEE HAD ASKED
- 11 TO BE BROUGHT BEFORE YOU RESULTING FROM THE
- 12 DISCUSSIONS ON TITLE 27 OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF
- MONTHS. THERE WAS SOME CONCERN EXPRESSED BY THE
- 14 COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD ABOUT FINDING WAYS TO
- 15 PROVIDE EITHER A LITTLE MORE TIME FOR STAFF IN
- 16 REVIEWING PERMIT PACKAGES OR PERHAPS FINDING BETTER
- 17 WAYS TO GET MORE COMPLETE PACKAGES TO COME BEFORE
- 18 THE COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD WHEN THEY ARE
- 19 SUBMITTED.
- 20 WHAT I'VE DONE IN THIS ITEM IS
- 21 PRESENTED A LOT OF HISTORICAL INFORMATION. IN
- 22 FACT, THE BULK OF THE ITEM IS REPLICATED FROM A
- 23 DECEMBER 1996 ITEM IN WHICH WE HAD PRESENTED ACTUAL

- 24 DRAFT REGULATIONS WHICH WOULD HAVE ESTABLISHED A
- 25 FILING DATE FOR PROPOSED PERMITS WHERE THE BOARD

COULD DETERMINE WHEN THE 60-DAY CLOCK ACTUALLY 2 STARTED. FROM THAT POINT IN DECEMBER OF '96, 3 WE WERE DIRECTED TO TAKE THE MATTER TO THE DIRECTORS OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, WHICH WE DID IN 5 6 EARLY 1997, AND MET WITH A LITTLE RESISTANCE WITH THE PROPOSAL FOR THE REGULATIONS, BUT WHAT WE DID 7 WAS WE CAME OUT WITH AN AGREEMENT TO INFORMALLY 8 9 NOTIFY AND LET THE LEA'S THROUGHOUT THE STATE KNOW 10 OF WHAT THE BOARD'S CALENDAR AND TIME LINES ARE FOR 11 THE 60-DAY CLOCK IN ORDER TO GET WHAT THE PROCESSES ARE TO GET PERMITS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE AND BOARD. 12 SO WE DID THAT IN APRIL OF '97, AND 13 14 THAT WAS FAIRLY WELL RECEIVED BY THE LEA'S. SORT OF THE REACTION AND EXPERIENCE WITH THAT OVER THE 15 LAST SIX OR SEVEN MONTHS HAS BEEN MIXED. SEVERAL 16 PERMIT PACKAGES HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED IN A MANNER 17 COGNIZANT OF THE TIME FRAMES SO THAT WE ARE GIVEN A 18 SUFFICIENT AMOUNT OF TIME TO PREPARE PACKAGES AND 19 RECOMMENDATIONS. SOMETIMES THEY STILL COME IN KIND 20 OF SHORT AND KIND OF JAM STAFF IN GETTING THE ITEMS 21

SO THAT IS A LITTLE BIT OF THE

22

23

TO YOU.

- 24 BACKGROUND OF WHERE THIS IS AT. WE HAD NOT PURSUED
- THE REGULATIONS BECAUSE OF THE APPROACH OF

1	INFORMALLY WORKING WITH THE LEA'S. IN FACT, WE HAD
2	PLANNED ON DOING THE SAME THING ONCE THE BOARD
3	ADOPTS THEIR 1998 CALENDAR. WE WOULD PREPARE A
4	SIMILAR LETTER TO THE LEA'S LETTING THEM KNOW WHAT
5	THAT CALENDAR IS AND WHAT THE LEAD-TIMES ARE FOR
6	BOTH THE BOARD MEETINGS AND THE COMMITTEE MEETINGS.
7	WE HAVE PROVIDED THIS IS AN
8	INFORMATION ITEM. WE REALLY ARE OPEN TO DISCUSS
9	OPTIONS AS TO WHERE THE BOARD AND COMMITTEE MIGHT
10	LIKE TO GO WITH THIS. WE'VE OFFERED ON PAGE 81
11	SEVERAL OPTIONS RANGING FROM PERHAPS STATUTORY
12	CHANGES TO ADDRESS, YOU KNOW, COMPLETE PERMIT
13	PACKAGES TO PERHAPS A REGULATORY CHANGE. ANOTHER
14	OPTION WOULD BE TO REVISIT THE REGULATIONS WITH
15	REGARD TO THE STANDARDIZED PERMIT WHERE THE BOARD
16	PROVIDED FOR A 30-DAY PERIOD FOR CONCURRENCE AND
17	MAYBE RECONSIDER THAT IN LIGHT OF THE CRUNCHES THAT
18	ARE CREATED BY THAT, AND MAYBE THINK ABOUT MAKING
19	IT 60, THE SAME AS THE FULL PERMIT.
20	ANOTHER OPTION WOULD BE TO CONSIDER
21	DELEGATING APPROVAL OF STANDARDIZED PERMITS TO THE
22	DEPUTY DIRECTOR. THAT'S NOT BEEN SOMETHING THAT

THE COMMITTEE HAS EMBRACED IN THE PAST, BUT WE

23

- THOUGHT, IN THE SPIRIT OF PUTTING OUT ALL THE
- OPTIONS WE CAN THINK OF, WE LISTED THEM OUT HERE.

- 1 WHO KNOWS. IT'S UP TO YOU WHERE YOU WANT TO TAKE
- 2 THIS.
- 3 REALLY, ANOTHER IDEA, WHICH WE HAVE
- 4 BEEN PRESENTING SEVERAL TIMES, IS THE IDEA OF
- 5 INCREASING OUR ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING TO LEA'S,
- 6 AND THAT TIES IN WITH OUR INTENT WITH THE APRIL
- 7 LETTER WAS TO TRY AND LET THEM KNOW WHAT OUR
- 8 CONSTRAINTS ARE INTERNALLY. AND WE WILL CONTINUE
- 9 TO DO THAT, TO WORK WITH LEA'S SO THAT THEIR
- 10 SUBMITTALS OF PACKAGES DON'T CAUSE US COMING UP
- 11 SHORT IN GIVING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE.
- DOROTHY, DO YOU WANT TO ADD ANYTHING
- 13 AT THIS POINT? THAT'S -- IT'S AN INFORMATION ITEM.
- 14 I BELIEVE IN AUGUST YOU HAD ASKED WE BRING THIS
- BACK, SO WE'RE OPEN TO DISCUSS WHERE YOU WANT TO GO
- 16 WITH THIS ISSUE.
- 17 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, FIRST I WANT TO
- 18 THANK STAFF FOR DOING THIS WORK. WE'VE BEEN
- 19 STRUGGLING OVER MANY YEARS WITH THIS, THE
- TIMELINESS ISSUE ON PERMITS.
- 21 MY THOUGHTS ARE THAT IF IT WERE
- 22 POSSIBLE, I WOULD PREFER A COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND
- 23 START THE CLOCK AT THAT POINT. I THINK THERE ARE

- PEOPLE WHO, NO DOUBT, DISAGREE WITH THAT, BUT I
- THINK THAT'S A CLEANER, MORE RATIONAL PROCESS. I

- 1 BELIEVE IT WILL HAVE A BETTER OUTCOME; BUT IF
- 2 THAT'S NOT A WAY THE BOARD WISHES TO GO AT THIS
- 3 POINT, I THINK WE'LL BE IN A PERIOD OF
- 4 EXPERIMENTATION IN THIS TRANSITION TO MORE LEA
- 5 ACCOUNTABILITY BECAUSE THE FLIP SIDE OF THIS, AND
- 6 HAD A GOOD DISCUSSION WITH MS. RICE YESTERDAY ON
- 7 THIS POINT, IS THAT THE BOARD WILL BE LESS
- 8 AVAILABLE, AS I SEE IT, AS WE TRANSFER OUR -- NOT
- 9 TRANSFER. THAT'S NOT THE WORD I WANTED TO USE --
- 10 ADJUST OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LEA COMMUNITY,
- 11 THAT IF PERMITS ARE SUBMITTED AND THEY ARE
- 12 INCOMPLETE, HISTORICALLY WHAT WE'VE DONE, AS I
- 13 UNDERSTAND IT, IS WORKED VERY HARD TO MAKE SURE
- 14 THAT WHEN IT FINALLY REACHES THE BOARD, ALL THE
- 15 ISSUES HAVE BEEN DEALT WITH. AND SOMETIMES THAT'S
- 16 GONE DOWN TO THE WIRE WITH I WOULD SAY VERY
- 17 SIGNIFICANT TIME ALLOCATIONS FROM OUR STAFF.
- 18 WE'RE TRYING TO IMPROVE OUR ABILITY
- 19 TO FUNCTION UNDER TIGHTER BUDGETS, AND I DON'T
- 20 BELIEVE THAT STAFF WILL BE AS AVAILABLE,
- 21 PERSONALLY, MY SENSE IS, NOR SHOULD THEY BE REALLY
- 22 IF THIS SYSTEM IS GOING TO BE WHAT WE ARE
- 23 ANTICIPATING IT TO BE.

24		IN THAT CASE	, AS I THII	NK YOU HAVE
25	SAID ON SEVER	RAL OCCASIONS,	MR. JONES	, WE MAY BE

```
COMPLETENESS. AND SO I SEE THIS AS JUST A BETTER
 2
       WAY TO GO. BUT I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE WILL OR
 3
       PLEASURE OF THE BOARD WOULD BE AS A WHOLE. I THINK
       IT WOULD HAVE A BETTER OUTCOME, BUT I'LL STOP
 5
 6
       THERE. I THINK IT'S AN IMPORTANT DISCUSSION.
              CHAIRMAN JONES: RIGHT. I'M GOING TO JUST
 7
       BUILD OFF WHAT YOU SAID BECAUSE I AGREE. I THINK
 8
       THE KEY TO THIS THING, AND IT'S PART OF THE
 9
       STATUTE, AS I READ IT, IS THAT WE ACCEPT A COMPLETE
10
       PACKAGE. SO I THINK THAT WHAT A METHOD MAY BE IS
11
       TO, YOU HAVE A CHECKLIST THAT GOES OUT AS PART OF
12
       THE RDSI BOOKLET THAT LET'S PEOPLE KNOW WHAT HAS TO
13
14
       BE IN THAT PACKAGE. AND I THINK THAT WHAT WE NEED
       TO DO IS HAVE THAT SAME CHECKLIST, AND WHEN AN
15
       ENVELOPE GETS OPENED WITH A PERMIT, THAT WE GO
16
       THROUGH THAT CHECKLIST AND VERIFY THAT ALL OF THOSE
17
       ITEMS ARE THERE. IF SOMETHING IS MISSING, CALL THE
18
```

LEA AND SAY, LOOK, WE'RE MISSING THIS PIECE OF YOUR

PROBLEM WITH NOT CONCURRING IN A PERMIT. I HAVE A

PROBLEM WITH NOT CONCURRING IN A PERMIT BECAUSE

AND BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, I DON'T HAVE A

PACKAGE; THEREFORE, YOUR PACKAGE ISN'T COMPLETE.

FACED WITH NONCONCURRENCE BECAUSE OF LACK OF

1

19

20

21

22

- 24 SOMEBODY LEFT ONE PIECE OF PAPER OUT OF A PACKAGE.
- 25 AND I DON'T REALLY -- EVEN IF THEY'VE DONE IT AND

- 1 THEY JUST BLEW IT AND DIDN'T INCLUDE IT, I HATE TO
- 2 HAVE TO NOT CONCUR BECAUSE A PIECE OF PAPER WASN'T
- 3 THERE. BUT BY THE SAME TOKEN, I HATE GETTING
- 4 BRIEFED TWO DAYS BEFORE PERMITTING COMMITTEE AND
- 5 HAVING FIVE ITEMS STILL UNANSWERED.
- AND I KNOW AS AN OPERATOR MY LEA'S
- 7 NEVER TOOK THE PACKAGES AS COMPLETE UNTIL ALL OF
- 8 THOSE ITEMS WERE DONE. AND I DON'T WANT TO
- 9 UNNECESSARILY PROLONG THE PROCESS, BUT I THINK THAT
- 10 THAT -- AND I NEED HELP FROM EITHER LEGAL STAFF OR
- 11 FROM THE COMMITTEE. I THINK IT SAYS A COMPLETE
- 12 PACKAGE, AND THE LEA'S ARE GOING TO CERTIFY THAT
- 13 THE PACKAGE THAT THEY ARE SUBMITTING IS NOT ONLY
- 14 COMPLETE, BUT IT IS ACCURATE. AND I THINK, BASED
- ON THAT STATEMENT, THAT IF WE ACCEPT THAT AND WE
- 16 GET THROUGH THE PACKAGE AND WE FIND OUT, IN FACT,
- 17 THAT SOMETHING ISN'T ACCURATE OR DOESN'T REFLECT
- 18 THINGS, THEN THAT, UNFORTUNATELY, IS GOING TO BE
- 19 CAUSE NOT TO CONCUR.
- 20 SO I THINK THAT A CHECKLIST, AND I
- 21 WOULD TAKE IT ONE STEP FURTHER MAYBE, IS I WOULD
- 22 ASK STAFF, IF IT'S OKAY WITH MR. RELIS, YOU SENT
- 23 LETTERS OUT IN APRIL OR MAY?

24 MR. DIER: APRIL.

25 CHAIRMAN JONES: CAN WE GET SOME KIND OF

40

```
A -- SINCE THOSE LETTERS WENT OUT, AND MAYBE APRIL
       WOULDN'T BE THE RIGHT MONTH TO START, MAYBE GIVE
 2
       THEM A LITTLE BIT OF TIME BECAUSE THERE WERE SOME
 3
       THINGS IN THE HOPPER, TAKE A LOOK AT WHAT PERMITS
       CAME IN, THE DATE WE RECEIVED THEM, AND WHAT THE
 5
 6
       DATE OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING WAS. IF THAT'S
       NOT -- IF THAT'S TOO BURDENSOME, I DON'T KNOW HOW
 7
       YOUR RECORDKEEPING GOES, BUT I DON'T THINK WE'VE
 8
 9
       SEEN THAT MANY PERMITS IN THE LAST THREE OR FOUR
       MONTHS, THAT WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO GO BACK AND LOOK
10
      AT THE TIME STAMPS AND --
11
               MR. DIER: GETTING THE INFORMATION IS NOT
12
       DIFFICULT. IN FACT, FOR PREPARATION FOR THIS
13
14
       DISCUSSION, I HAD POLLED STAFF JUST ON THEIR
       EXPERIENCES SINCE THAT LETTER WENT OUT. I DIDN'T
15
       ASK FOR SPECIFIC DATES, BUT I ASKED FOR THEIR
16
       GENERAL EXPERIENCES, WHETHER OR NOT THE LEA'S --
17
       THEIR LEA'S WERE WILLING TO WORK WITH THEM ON THE
18
       TIMING OF SUBMITTALS OR IF THE SUBMITTALS WERE
19
       PRETTY MUCH MADE WITHOUT REGARD FOR OUR TIME
20
       FRAMES. AND THE REACTIONS ARE MIXED.
21
22
                     YOU KNOW, THERE ARE CASES THAT ARE --
```

THERE WAS COOPERATION, AND THERE -- WE HAVE SEVERAL

- 24 EXAMPLES WHERE THERE WAS NO REGARD FOR OUR TIME
- FRAMES.

```
CHAIRMAN JONES: WOULD IT BE EASY OR EASY
 1
      ENOUGH TO PUT THAT TOGETHER FOR THE BOARD MEETING
 2
      SO THAT WHEN WE LOOK AT THIS ITEM -- OR I GUESS
 3
      WE'RE NOT -- ARE WE GOING TO LOOK AT THIS ITEM OR
      IT'S JUST DISCUSSION?
 5
 6
              MS. RICE: THIS IS NOT ON THE BOARD
 7
      AGENDA.
              CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. WELL, MAYBE FOR
 8
9
      THE NEXT PERMITTING COMMITTEE, IF WE JUST GOT AN
10
      IDEA, YOU KNOW, AS TO WHAT THE PERMITS WERE, WHAT
11
      THE FILING DATES WERE, AND WHEN THE COMMITTEE
      MEETING WAS SO THAT --
12
              MR. DIER: WITHOUT IDENTIFYING WHO THE
13
14
      FACILITY WAS.
               CHAIRMAN JONES: YOU DON'T HAVE TO
15
      IDENTIFY WHO THE FACILITY IS. IT'S JUST TO GET AN
16
      IDEA OF HOW JAMMED WE ARE. AND I THINK IT WOULD
17
      GIVE US A CONTEXT TO LOOK AT IT THAT MIGHT BE MORE
18
      RELEVANT, YOU KNOW. AND BUT -- I DON'T KNOW.
19
                    CAN WE LEGALLY ON THE OTHER ISSUE,
20
      WHEN I TALKED ABOUT IF AN LEA CERTIFIES THAT A
21
22
      PACKAGE IS COMPLETE AND ACCURATE WHEN IT IS SENT TO
```

US, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THAT IS, IN FACT, THE

- 24 PARAMETERS OF THEM SENDING US A PERMIT, CORRECT?
- MS. RICE: THAT'S NOW IN REGULATION.

1	CHAIRMAN JONES: CAN WE AS AN
2	ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENT SEND THEM A CHECKLIST
3	AND US HAVE A CHECKLIST AND GO THROUGH THAT
4	CHECKLIST WHEN WE GET THE PACKAGE IN TO MAKE SURE
5	THAT ALL THE PIECES, IN FACT, ARE THERE?
6	MS. RICE: OUR UNDERSTANDING IS NO IN
7	TERMS OF NOT ACCEPTING THE PERMIT. WE GO THROUGH
8	IT, CLEARLY, IN ORDER TO PREPARE THE ITEM FOR YOUR
9	CONSIDERATION, AND WE GIVE OUR ANALYSIS OF WHAT WE
10	FEEL IS THE STATUS OF THE VARIOUS REQUIRED
11	COMPONENTS, BUT WE HAVE NOT FELT WE HAD THE
12	AUTHORITY TO SEND IT BACK AND SAY THESE ELEMENTS
13	ARE MISSING. WE WON'T START OUR PROCESSING OF IT
14	WHICH IS WHY WE HAVE USED THIS ITERATIVE PROCESS OF
15	WORKING COOPERATIVELY WITH THE OPERATOR AND LEA TO
16	TRY TO GET THE PERMIT IN SHAPE FOR THE EARLIEST
17	POSSIBLE HEARING OR TO WAIVE TIME FRAMES IF
18	NECESSARY.
19	THAT IS IN A SENSE THE REASON WHY
20	SEVERAL OF THE OPTIONS ARE PRESENTED TO YOU TODAY
21	BECAUSE THAT WAS OUR UNDERSTANDING, THAT WE NEEDED
22	TO EITHER DO THAT IN REGULATION OR STATUTE, PROVIDE
23	US SOME ABILITY TO EITHER SET FILING DATES SO THAT

- 24 WE COULD HAVE MORE PREDICTABILITY OR TO GIVE US A
- 25 COMPLETENESS REVIEW, WHICH CURRENTLY WE HAD NOT, AT

```
TO DO IN REGULATION AND STATUTE.
               CHAIRMAN JONES: I HAVE A QUESTION. I'M
 3
       STILL NEW TO THIS GAME. DOESN'T THE WORD
       "COMPLETE" MEAN THAT EVERYTHING IS THERE?
 5
 6
               MR. DIER: ALL THE PIECES ARE THERE.
               CHAIRMAN JONES: THAT THEY'RE DONE RIGHT.
 7
       AND THAT'S FINE. I DON'T WANT TO -- I THINK
 8
 9
       THERE'S TWO SEPARATE ISSUES HERE. I THINK ONE
10
       ISSUE IS HAVE YOU SENT ALL THE PIECES IN? AND
11
       UNDER THE COMPLETENESS PART OF THE REGULATIONS, IT
       WOULD SEEM TO ME THAT WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO GO
12
      THROUGH A CHECKLIST AND MAKE SURE. I'M NOT TALKING
13
14
      ABOUT THE ACCURACY BECAUSE I THINK THAT WHAT I'M
      TRYING TO AVOID IS IF THE PIECES CAME IN AND ALL
15
       THE PIECES WERE THERE, OKAY, THEN IT BECOMES AN
16
       ISSUE OF HOW ACCURATE ARE THEY? AND THAT IS MORE
17
       THE BASIS OF DO WE CONCUR OR DO WE NOT CONCUR.
18
                    THIS IS STRICTLY MINISTERIAL, THAT
19
```

ARE ALL THE PIECES THERE THAT WE CAN EVEN LOOK AT

THEM? AND I THINK THAT HAS BEEN A PROBLEM, HASN'T

MS. RICE: I BELIEVE THE ISSUE HAS BEEN,

20

21

22

23

IT?

LEAST PREVIOUSLY, FELT WE WERE GIVEN THE LATITUDE

- 24 AT LEAST FROM MY UNDERSTANDING, THAT REGULATION IS
- 25 CLEAR THAT THE LEA HAS A COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND IS

GIVEN 30 DAYS TO DO THAT. STATUTE AND REGULATION IN SPEAKING TO THE BOARD SPEAK TO RECEIPT OF THE 2 PERMIT APPLICATION, NOTHING ABOUT COMPLETENESS, 3 JUST SHEAR RECEIPT OF IT; IN OTHER WORDS, YOU GOT IT IN THE MAIL. SO THAT HAS BEEN THE 5 6 INTERPRETATION THAT I HAVE UNDERSTOOD THE YEARS THAT I'VE BEEN AT THE BOARD, WHICH IS WHY WE HAVE 7 FELT CONSTRAINED WITHOUT REGULATORY CHANGE TO PUT 8 9 ANY MORE SCREEN ON IT THAN RECEIPT STARTING THE 60-DAY CLOCK. 10 IT IS VERY CLEAR IN REGULATION THAT 11 THE LEA HAS A COMPLETENESS REVIEW, AND THE RECENT 12 CHANGE WE'VE BEEN DISCUSSING WITH THE TITLE 27 13 14 REGULATIONS IS THAT THEY NOW CERTIFY TO US THAT THE PACKAGE IS COMPLETE AND CORRECT. BUT WE DID NOT 15 ADD A COMPLETENESS REVIEW FOR THE BOARD. SO THE --16 IT'S REALLY HOW YOU DEFINE RECEIPT. WHAT IS 17 RECEIPT OF A PACKAGE? IS IT RECEIPT OF A COMPLETE 18 PACKAGE OR JUST RECEIPT OF A PACKAGE? AND TO DATE 19 IT'S BEEN CONSTRUED TO BE JUST RECEIPT OF THE 20 PACKAGE, WHICH IS, I THINK, WHY WE'VE ALWAYS 21

PROPOSED IT AS A POTENTIAL REGULATORY CHANGE. AND

THAT MAY JUST BE THE HISTORY OF HOW WE'VE DEALT

22

24 WITH IT ALL THESE YEARS.

25 CHAIRMAN JONES: I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU

```
COMPLETE. TO ME THAT'S JUST COMMON SENSE. I'D
 3
       LIKE US TO LOOK DOWN THAT ROAD A LITTLE BIT AND --
       BECAUSE I THINK WE CAN ASSERT THAT. I THINK BY
 5
       DEFINITION WE CAN ASSERT. WE'RE NOT SAYING IT'S
 6
       GOT TO BE PERFECT, JUST MAKE SURE ALL THE PIECES
 7
       ARE THERE BECAUSE I KNOW FOR A FACT THAT PEOPLE
 8
 9
       HAVE CALLED UP AND SAID, "I'VE GOT A PACKAGE COMING
       IN IN THREE WEEKS. GET IT ON THE DOCKET, " AND THAT
10
11
       GIVES A WEEK FOR US TO REVIEW IT. I DON'T THINK
       THAT'S THE INTENT OF RECEIPT OF A PACKAGE.
12
```

MEMBER RELIS: SO, MR. CHAIR, ARE YOU

MS. RICE: RECEIPT OF A PROPOSED PERMIT.

BOARD MEMBER RELIS: SO OPENING THAT AND

SAYING THAT -- THERE ARE TWO ISSUES, OKAY. RIGHT

NOW THE 60-DAY CLOCK IS TRIGGERED BY A LETTER -- A

PACKET ARRIVING. FORGET WHAT THE CONTENTS ARE.

ONCE IT'S ARRIVED, THE CLOCK'S TICKING, RIGHT?

GOING THROUGH A CHECKLIST AND FINDING OUT WHETHER

IT'S COMPLETE OR NOT HAS NO BEARING ON THAT CLOCK.

AND THE ISSUE THAT YOU HAVE RAISED IS SHOULD WE NOT

HAVE THE CLOCK START AFTER IT'S DEEMED THAT

FEEL, MR. RELIS. I FEEL, AS AN OPERATOR, I

COULDN'T GIVE THEM EVERYTHING UNLESS IT WAS

1

2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 24 SOMEONE'S GONE THROUGH, CHECKED OFF ALL THOSE
- 25 POINTS, AND THEN THE CLOCK STARTS. THAT'S THE, I

- 1 GUESS, THE DECISION THAT COULD BE CONTEMPLATED.
- 2 I KNOW THAT'S NOT -- THAT'S A
- 3 DISCUSSION TODAY. AND I GUESS THE QUESTION WOULD
- 4 BE WOULD WE WANT TO DOCKET THAT AS A CONSIDERATION
- 5 ITEM.
- 6 I WOULD ADD ALSO THAT FROM OUR RECENT
- 7 EXPERIENCES WITH THE STANDARDIZED PERMIT, WE'VE HAD
- 8 A COUPLE OF REALLY MESSY STANDARDIZED PERMIT
- 9 HEARINGS THAT I DON'T THINK SERVE THE APPLICANT OR
- 10 US WELL. AND I WOULD -- I WOULD LIKE TO OPEN THAT
- 11 ISSUE, CONSIDER A 60-DAY ON THE STANDARDIZED
- 12 BECAUSE OF THE RIDICULOUS TIME FRAME WE WERE IN ON
- 13 TWO OCCASIONS AND WITH NOT A VERY SUCCESSFUL
- 14 OUTCOME. WE INITIATED THAT IN THE BELIEF THAT THIS
- 15 WOULD BE A WAY OF SAVING TIME AND EXPEDITING
- 16 CERTAIN TYPES OF PERMITS THAT WE THOUGHT WERE OF A
- 17 LOWER THRESHOLD. AND I'M AFRAID THAT HASN'T WORKED
- 18 OUT AS WELL AS THE BOARD THOUGHT IT MIGHT.
- 19 MS. TOBIAS: I WILL SAY, MR. RELIS, AND I
- 20 WAS IN ON THE EARLY DISCUSSIONS AND ADOPTION OF
- 21 THOSE TIERED REGULATIONS, THE IDEA WAS REALLY TO
- 22 GIVE OPERATORS SOME REASON TO FIT INTO THE
- 23 DIFFERENT TIERS. SO THAT WAS ACTUALLY PROPOSED AS

- AN INCENTIVE. AND AS MR. DIER AND OTHER STAFF HAVE
- 25 POINTED OUT OVER TIME, THE BOARD, FOR, YOU KNOW,

- 1 THEIR OWN LEGITIMATE REASONS, HAS NOT WANTED TO
- 2 DELEGATE THE APPROVAL OF THAT TO STAFF, THAT THE
- 3 ORIGINAL PROPOSAL HAD BEEN THAT WE COULD DO IT IN
- 4 30 DAYS BECAUSE THE PERMIT SHOULD COME IN TO MEET
- 5 CERTAIN STANDARDS. THAT'S THE WHOLE BASIS OF
- 6 STANDARDIZED PERMIT. AND IF IT CAME IN AND MET
- 7 THOSE STANDARDS, THEY REALLY DID NOT NEED THAT HIGH
- 8 LEVEL OF DISCRETIONARY REVIEW BY THE BOARD.
- 9 MEMBER RELIS: BUT -- I THINK YOU LEFT OUT
- 10 ONE POINT. WE DID LEAVE IT DISCRETIONARY INSOFAR
- 11 AS UNLESS THERE WAS CONTROVERSY, IT WAS THE
- 12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER HAS THE AUTHORITY.
- MR. DIER: THE DRAFT OF THE TIERED REGS,
- 14 THE 30 DAYS, AS I RECALL, WAS PRESENTED IN THE
- DRAFT OF THE TIERED REGS IN CONJUNCTION WITH
- 16 DELEGATION, AND THE DELEGATION WAS REMOVED FROM THE
- 17 REGS WHEN THEY WERE ADOPTED, BUT THE 30 DAYS WASN'T
- 18 CHANGED.
- 19 MS. TOBIAS: THE IDEA WAS, I THINK,
- 20 ORIGINALLY --
- 21 MEMBER RELIS: THAT'S RIGHT. I THINK WE
- NEED TO SOMEHOW COME UP WITH A COMBINATION. WE
- 23 LIKE THE INCENTIVE SIDE, BUT WE ALSO REALIZE THAT

- THERE WERE GOING TO BE CASES WHERE IT WAS NOT
- 25 GOING -- WHERE THE BOARD WANTED A LOOK AT SOME OF

- 1 THESE. AND SO THAT'S WHY, I THINK, WE CONCLUDED AT
- THAT TIME THAT, YEAH, WE'LL SHORTEN THE TIME FRAME,
- 3 KEEP BOARD OVERSIGHT.
- 4 MS. TOBIAS: WELL, IT MAY BE TIME TO
- 5 REVIEW THAT AGAIN AS STAFF HAVE BROUGHT THIS
- 6 FORWARD BEFORE, AND THE BOARD HAS BEEN THUS FAR
- 7 UNWILLING TO CONSIDER THAT. IT MAY BE TIME TO LOOK
- 8 AT IT AGAIN AND TO SEE IF THERE COULD BE A WAY TO
- 9 MOVE IT TO A DELEGATION WITH THE ABILITY OF THE
- 10 BOARD TO EITHER PULL UP A PERMIT IF THEY GET WIND
- OF SOMETHING OR TO HAVE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OR
- 12 THE DEPUTY TO BE ABLE TO SAY, NO, THIS ONE DOES
- 13 HAVE, YOU KNOW, SOME CONFLICT WITH IT. MAYBE ADOPT
- 14 SOME GUIDELINES SO THAT --
- 15 MEMBER RELIS: BECAUSE, IN EFFECT, WHAT WE
- 16 WERE TRYING TO DO WITH THAT WAS THE CONSENT AGENDA.
- 17 THAT'S WHAT I MEANT. AT THE OUTSET WE WERE
- 18 ATTEMPTING TO PUT THESE TYPES OF PERMITS IN A
- 19 CONSENT MODE UNLESS THEY WERE PULLED.
- 20 MS. TOBIAS: THIRTY DAYS DOESN'T WORK FOR
- 21 THAT.
- 22 MEMBER RELIS: SEE, THAT'S THE PROBLEM,
- 23 RIGHT.

- MS. RICE: BASED ON OUR EXPERIENCE,
- 25 DELEGATION MAY NOT WORK ALL THAT EFFECTIVELY EITHER

- 1 BECAUSE THE WAY YOU HAVE TRADITIONALLY DELEGATED IS
- 2 YOU DELEGATE THE ABILITY TO SAY YES. IF THERE ARE
- 3 ANY ISSUES OR IF THERE IS KNOWN OPPOSITION, YOU
- 4 HAVE WANTED TO SEE THOSE, AND RIGHTFULLY SO.
- 5 AS WE'VE SEEN, MANY OF THE COMPOST
- 6 FACILITIES HAVE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THEM THAT
- 7 COME TO YOUR ATTENTION, AND YOU'RE LIKELY TO WANT
- 8 TO HEAR THOSE ISSUES.
- 9 IT MAY BE THAT THE ISSUE WE'RE TRYING
- 10 TO ADDRESS, WHICH IS SHORT TIME FRAME TO REVIEW A
- 11 COMPLEX PROJECT, IS NOT ADDRESSED BY DELEGATION
- 12 BECAUSE YOU'D BE REVIEWING IT IN 30 DAYS ANYWAY
- 13 BECAUSE IT WOULD BE ONE YOU WOULD WISH TO HEAR, AND
- 14 YOUR DELEGATION WOULD SAY YOU SHOULD HEAR IT
- 15 BECAUSE THERE ARE ISSUES THERE.
- SO I THINK OUR EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN
- 17 THAT DELEGATION MAY NOT BE THE ANSWER, BUT
- 18 REVIEWING THE REGULATION AND WHETHER THE 30 DAYS IS
- 19 EFFECTIVE MAY BE A GOOD WAY TO GO.
- MS. TOBIAS: MR. CHAIR, IF I COULD, I'D
- 21 LIKE TO -- SUZANNE HAMBLETON HAS BROUGHT TO MY
- 22 ATTENTION, AND I THINK WE'RE ALL STILL WORKING WITH
- 23 THESE TITLE 27 REGS, BUT SHE'S POINTING OUT IN

- 24 SECTION 21685 THAT THE REGULATION DOES SAY THAT
- 25 CIWMB SHALL NOT CONCUR IN THE ISSUANCE OF A

```
PROPOSED PERMIT IF THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION HAS
 1
       NOT BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE LEA AND THE BOARD. AND
 2
       THEN BASICALLY IT'S ALL OUR ISSUE REQUIREMENTS.
 3
                     SO I THINK THAT THAT'S ONE WAY THAT
       MAY HELP WITH THIS, AND THEN THE QUESTION, I THINK,
 5
       THAT DOROTHY IS BRINGING UP IS THAT WE'VE ALWAYS
 6
       INTERPRETED THAT ISSUE OF THE WORD "RECEIPT." I
 7
       HAVE TO SAY THAT WAS DONE BY MY PREDECESSOR. IT'S
 8
 9
       SOMETHING THAT WE COULD LOOK AT AND SEE IF THERE'S
       A BASIS IN WHICH TO CHANGE THAT.
10
                     I THINK THAT DEPUTY DIRECTOR RICE IS
11
       INTERESTED IN PERHAPS AN ABILITY TO REVIEW THESE
12
       PERMITS FOR A COMPLETENESS. THE LEGAL OFFICE WOULD
13
14
       STILL SUPPORT THE IDEA OF A CALENDARING BASIS. WE
       FEEL THAT THERE -- AND YOU MAY HAVE NOTICED THAT ON
15
       A NUMBER OF THE PERMITS OVER THE LAST YEAR, WE'VE
16
       INDICATED ON OUR SIGN-OFF THAT THERE'S INSUFFICIENT
17
       INFORMATION THAT WE ARE NOT SIGNING OFF ON THE
18
       REVIEW BECAUSE ON A NUMBER OF THESE, WE DON'T WANT
19
       TO LEAVE THE IMPRESSION THAT THE LEGAL OFFICE IS
20
       BASICALLY SAYING OKAY. I THINK IT'S A SMALL POINT,
21
       BUT NEVERTHELESS IT'S DIFFICULT, I THINK, FOR BOTH
22
```

THE BOARD AND THE LEGAL OFFICE TO, YOU KNOW, KNOW

- 24 WHAT'S REALLY COMING UP TO THEM WHEN HALF THE
- 25 INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME THAT YOU

- 1 REVIEW THE AGENDA ITEM.
- 2 SO TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, I THINK WE
- 3 SUPPORT STAFF IN WHAT THEY'RE DOING, BUT WE ALSO
- 4 SUPPORT THE IDEA OF AT LEAST ATTEMPTING SOME KIND
- 5 OF CALENDARING OPTION PERHAPS FOR A YEAR, MAYBE
- 6 REVIEWING IT IN A YEAR AND SEE HOW IT WORKS, HOW
- 7 THE LEA'S COME BACK AND TELL US WHETHER IT'S BEEN
- 8 DIFFICULT TO DEAL WITH OR NOT. IN THE MEANTIME WE
- 9 CAN CERTAINLY LOOK AT THE RECEIPT IDEA AND -- FROM
- 10 A LEGAL STANDPOINT.
- 11 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, WE'VE ALSO HAD
- MORE CASES THAT I RECALL WHERE WE'RE COMING RIGHT
- DOWN IN BRIEFING TO NO RECOMMENDATION, AWAITING
- 14 FURTHER INFORMATION. AND THAT ALWAYS DISTRESSES
- 15 ME. I MEAN I'M AT A BRIEFING AND I'M GOING, "WELL,
- OKAY, WE'RE PROBABLY GOING TO GET IT, AND WHEN ARE
- WE GOING TO GET IT?" AND I JUST THINK THAT CREATES
- 18 HEARTBURN. AND THOSE WERE NOT ALTOGETHER
- 19 CONTROVERSIAL ONES, BUT CERTAINLY IN A CASE WHERE
- 20 WE HAVE SOME CONTROVERSY, SOME SUBSTANTIVE DEBATE,
- THAT'S GOING TO WEIGH HEAVILY.
- 22 CHAIRMAN JONES: I AGREE. I MEAN I THINK
- 23 THAT IT WOULD BE IMPORTANT TO SEE THAT LISTING THAT

- 24 WE HAD TO JUST SEE WHERE WE'RE FALLING OUT IN THE
- 25 CALENDAR. AND I THINK THAT WOULD HELP US DETERMINE

```
WHERE TO GO.
 1
 2
                     AND THEN I WANT TO MAKE IT CLEAR AND
       I THINK I HAVE IS THAT WHEN I'M TALKING ABOUT THE
 3
       COMPLETENESS, I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT A REVIEW AS TO
       THE QUALITY OF THE WORK. I'M JUST LOOKING AT ARE
 5
       ALL THE ITEMS THERE, YOU KNOW, AND THEN IT STANDS
 6
       OR FALLS TWO MONTHS INTO THE PROCESS ON THE MERIT
 7
       OF THE PROJECT. BUT, YOU KNOW, I MEAN I JUST THINK
 8
 9
       TO BE MISSING ONE PIECE OF PAPER AND JUST MAKE THE
       CALL AND SAY, LOOK, I'VE GOT TO GET THIS IN HERE
10
       FOR THIS TO BE A COMPLETE PACKAGE IS FAIR TO THE
11
       OPERATOR, IT'S FAIR TO THE LEA, AND IT'S FAIR TO
12
      THIS BOARD BECAUSE I DON'T WANT THESE THINGS TO END
13
14
      UP GOING LONGER THAN THEY NEED TO.
                     SOMETIMES I THINK IT'S JUST AN
15
       OVERSIGHT OR SOMEBODY JUST MADE A DETERMINATION
16
       THAT, NO, WE'RE NOT GOING TO GIVE YOU THAT STUFF.
17
       WE DON'T THINK YOU HAVE THE NEED. THAT'S FINE. IF
18
       IT'S ON THE COMPLETENESS, THEN WE'RE NOT INCLUDING
19
       ANY OF THIS INFORMATION BECAUSE WE DON'T THINK YOU
20
       NEED IT, THEN THAT'S OKAY. I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM
21
```

WITH SEEING THAT. BUT, YOU KNOW, I JUST THINK IT'S

FAIR TO AN OPERATOR AND TO AN LEA TO LET THEM KNOW

22

- WE'RE MISSING TWO PIECES OF PAPER.
- MR. DIER: IT'S A SMALL POINT, BUT MAYBE

I'M WRONG, BUT I THINK THERE'S BEEN AN IMPRESSION 1 LEFT THAT STAFF DOESN'T DO A COMPLETENESS REVIEW 2 NOW, BUT WE DO. THAT'S ONE OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE 3 PERMIT STAFF. I THINK IT AT TIMES DOESN'T GET ACKNOWLEDGED WELL ENOUGH HOW MUCH OF AN EFFORT 5 6 STAFF DOES TO ACTUALLY CLEAN UP A LOT OF THESE PACKAGES BEFORE THEY GET TO COMMITTEE AND BOARD. 7 WE DO DO A COMPLETENESS REVIEW OF 8 EVERY PERMIT THAT COMES IN. THE PROBLEM IS THAT WE 9 10 DON'T HAVE THE ABILITY TO, SAY, STOP A CLOCK OR 11 ANYTHING. WE DO THE COMPLETENESS AND WE IMMEDIATELY LET THE LEA KNOW IF THERE ARE ANY 12 DEFICIENCIES, IF THERE'S ANY PIECES MISSING BECAUSE 13 14 THEN THE LEA AND THE OPERATOR HAVE THE OPTION TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT, WELL, WE'LL WITHDRAW IT AND 15 RESUBMIT IT, WE'LL WAIVE TIME. WE DON'T THINK 16 THAT'S AN ISSUE. WE'LL TAKE OUR SHOTS AT THE 17 COMMITTEE AND BOARD AND LET THEM DECIDE. 18 THERE'S SEVERAL OPTIONS AT THAT 19 POINT, BUT THAT'S ONE OF THE PRIMARY THINGS THAT 20 STAFF IS DOING IS REVIEWING THOSE PACKAGES AND 21 LETTING THE LEA KNOW AS SOON AS POSSIBLE WHETHER OR 22

NOT IT'S COMPLETE. WE CAN'T DO ANYTHING WITH IT

- 24 BEYOND THAT OTHER THAN ADVISING THE LEA AT THAT
- 25 POINT.

```
CHAIRMAN JONES: I UNDERSTAND THAT, DON.
 1
      WHAT I'M SAYING IS WHAT YOU'RE LOOKING AT AS PART
 2
      OF YOUR COMPLETENESS IS THE ACCURACY OF THE DATA.
 3
               MR. DIER: WELL, THAT'S PART OF THE WHOLE
      TITLE 27 DISCUSSION. YOU'RE CHANGING THE WAY IN
 5
 6
      WHICH WE LOOK AT THE DETAILS OF THAT PACKAGE.
      STILL TWO STEP. FIRST, ARE ALL THE PIECES THERE?
 7
      IF THERE'S ANYTHING MISSING, IMMEDIATELY LET THE
 8
      LEA KNOW. SECONDLY, THEN IF IT'S COMPLETE, WHAT IS
9
      THE --
10
11
              CHAIRMAN JONES: IS IT GOOD WORK?
               MR. DIER: IS IT GOOD WORK? THAT'S WHAT
12
      WE'RE REDEFINING. WE'RE STEPPING BACK FROM THE
13
14
      VERY DETAILED REVIEW OF THE SUPPORTING
      DOCUMENTATION. WE'RE LOOKING FOR CONSISTENCY. IS
15
      THE PROJECT CONSISTENT BETWEEN THE CEQA DOCUMENT,
16
      THE PERMIT, AND THE RFI? IF IT IS, NO PROBLEM.
17
               CHAIRMAN JONES: AND I THINK WE KNOW HOW
18
      HARD THE STAFF WORKS BECAUSE WE SEE YOU SCRAMBLING
19
      ALL THE TIME TO TRY TO GET THESE THINGS RESOLVED.
20
      IF WE DON'T ACKNOWLEDGE THAT ENOUGH, THEN THAT'S
21
      OUR FAULT. BUT YOU GUYS DO A GOOD JOB. I JUST
22
      WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WHAT I WANT IS NOT -- I
```

- 24 THINK TO MAKE SURE THAT IS THE CLOCK IS GOING TO
- 25 START, NOT THE ACCURACY PART, JUST THE FACT THAT

- 1 ALL THOSE PIECES ARE THERE, I THINK THAT'S FAIR TO
- 2 AN LEA AND TO AN OPERATOR.
- 3 WE HAD ONE SPEAKER. NORMALLY WE LET
- 4 THEM SPEAK FIRST, BUT I WANTED TO START THE
- 5 CONVERSATION. MR. SWEETSER, SORRY TO MAKE YOU
- 6 WAIT.
- 7 MR. SWEETSER: NO PROBLEM. USED TO BEING
- 8 AROUND HERE. LARRY SWEETSER AGAIN, DIRECTOR OF
- 9 REGULATORY AFFAIRS, NORCAL WASTE SYSTEMS. AND
- 10 SUPPORTING THE IDEA OF FIXING THE PROCESS. IT DOES
- 11 NEED SOME REFORM.
- 12 I KNOW I WOULD APPRECIATE, I'M SURE
- 13 WE ALL WOULD APPRECIATE A MORE BORING PROCESS ON
- 14 SOME OF THESE PERMITS RATHER THAN THIS MAD SCRAMBLE
- 15 AT THE END. I THINK WE NEED TO ALSO LOOK AT THE
- 16 REASONS FOR SOME OF THIS. IT'S NOT FAIR THAT
- 17 EVERYONE IS JAMMED. I KNOW STAFF, THE EFFORT THEY
- 18 PUT INTO SOME OF THESE PERMITS, ESPECIALLY ON THE
- 19 STANDARDIZED, I THINK THAT'S SOMETHING THAT DOES
- 20 NEED TO BE RELOOKED.
- 21 I KNOW THOSE OF US IN THE INDUSTRY
- 22 HAVE TALKED ABOUT THAT. WE DON'T REALLY SEE AS
- 23 MUCH BENEFIT AS WE THOUGHT THERE WOULD BE. AND WE

- 24 HAVE SEEN SOME ABUSES OF THE PROCESS. I HAVE NO
- 25 PROBLEMS AT ALL RELOOKING AT SOME OF THAT.

1	AND ALSO THE COMPLETENESS REVIEW, I
2	THINK, IS SOMETHING MORE THAN JUST MAKE SURE THE
3	CORRECT POSTAGE IS ON THE DOCUMENTS WHEN THEY GET
4	THERE. MAKING SURE THAT ALL THE PIECES ARE THERE
5	IS VERY HELPFUL TO HAVE THAT. AND IT'S NOT JUST
6	FOR THE REASONS THAT YOU MENTIONED AS FAR AS A
7	MISSING DOCUMENT OR SOMETHING THAT SOMEBODY MAY BE
8	TRYING TO HIDE. THERE'S ALSO CASES THAT OCCUR
9	WHERE SOMETHING NEW IS BEING REQUIRED, PARTICULARLY
10	IN REGARDS TO A CEQA ISSUE WHERE SOMETHING MAY NEED
11	TO BE LOOKED AT. AND THAT ALSO FIGURES INTO IT. I
12	KNOW IT'S CAUSED ME A LOT OF ISSUES, AND I KNOW
13	SOME OF OUR PLANNERS HAVE A LOT OF TROUBLE WITH
14	THAT ISSUE, SO IT'S NOT JUST THOSE TWO REASONS.
15	AND IT'S NICE TO BE ABLE TO HAVE A
16	COMPLETE AND EVERYTHING THERE. I DON'T WANT TO SEE
17	THAT DOOR CLOSED BECAUSE ONE PIECE OF PAPER IS
18	MISSING AND WE KNOW WE CAN GET IT TO YOU IN TIME.
19	THERE'S BEEN CASES WHERE THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN AND
20	WE'VE PULLED THE PERMIT. SO THAT'S NOT A
21	DISAGREEABLE ALTERNATIVE TO LOOKING AT THAT. BUT
22	JUST BECAUSE ONE PIECE OF PAPER ISN'T THERE, WE
23	KNOW IT'S COMING, LET'S NOT CLOSE THE DOOR ON AN

- 24 APPLICATION. IF IT'S INACCURATE, THAT'S ANOTHER
- 25 ISSUE.

WE NEED TO LOOK AT ALL THOSE REASONS 1 AS FAR AS WHAT'S INCOMPLETE, WHAT'S INACCURATE, AND 2 INCONSISTENCIES. THIS GETS BACK TO SOMETHING I 3 MENTIONED BEFORE AS FAR AS GETTING INVOLVED EARLIER IN THE PROCESS AND HAVING A LOT BETTER 5 6 UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT IT IS THAT'S SUPPOSED TO BE THERE BECAUSE EVEN WITH ALL THE EXPERIENCE A LOT OF 7 US HAVE, THESE PROBLEMS KEEP HAPPENING OVER AND 8 9 OVER AGAIN, AND THERE'S GOT TO BE A REASON ON THE 10 FRONT-END THAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED. AND THE PCP 11 PROPOSAL IS LOOKING AT THAT. AND THE SOONER WE ALL GET INVOLVED AND THE SOONER THAT PROCESS GETS UNDER 12 WAY I THINK THAT WILL ADDRESS A LOT OF THE 13 14 QUESTIONS. ONCE WE CLEARLY UNDERSTAND WHAT THE PROCESS IS, THERE'S GOING TO BE LESS EXCUSES FOR 15 16 WHY SOMETHING IS MISSING. MEMBER RELIS: I TAKE IT, THEN, YOU 17 WOULDN'T OPPOSE US CALENDARING A CONSIDERATION ITEM 18 ON THIS. 19 MR. SWEETSER: NOT AT ALL. I DO HAVE A 20 CONCERN ABOUT PLAYING WITH THE CLOCK A LITTLE BIT 21 TOO MUCH. WE LIKE THAT ABILITY THERE. I THINK 22

THERE IS DEFINITELY REASONS WHY WE NEED TO BE

- 24 LOOKING AT ON WHY THIS IS CONTINUALLY A PROBLEM,
- 25 AND I'D MUCH RATHER COME UP AND ARGUE ON SUBSTANCE

RATHER THAN CLAIMING A PIECE OF PAPER WASN'T THERE AND REASONS WHY. LET'S MOVE FAST, BUT LET'S NOT 2 MAKE IT TOO STRINGENT OF A PROCESS. THANK YOU. 3 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. THANKS. MS. TOBIAS: LEGAL OFFICE WILL LOOK AGAIN 5 6 AT THE ISSUE OF RECEIPT WITH P&E AND BASICALLY WORK WITH THE STAFF ON THAT PARTICULAR ISSUE. 7 MEMBER RELIS: SO THERE'S THE LEGAL ISSUE, 8 9 HOW WE'VE INTERPRETED WHEN THE CLOCK STARTS; THERE'S THE STANDARDIZED MATTER; AND THEN THERE'S 10 11 IF WE WERE TO CONCLUDE THAT THE LEGAL -- WELL, THAT'S ALL REALLY THE SAME ISSUE DEPENDING ON --12 MS TOBIAS: ON THE CALENDARING LEGAL HAS 13 14 ALWAYS TAKEN THE POSITION THAT WE ACTUALLY COULD DO THAT BY POLICY. YOU'RE ALLOWED -- FOR INTERNAL 15 POLICIES THAT THE BOARD ADOPTS, YOU DO NOT HAVE TO 16 PUT THOSE IN REGULATION. I WOULD SUGGEST THEY BE 17 IN REGULATION BECAUSE I THINK THE REGULATION 18 PROCESS ALLOWS FOR A HEARING AND NOTICE TO THE 19 PARTIES, AND I THINK THAT'S VERY IMPORTANT IN 20 LETTING ALL OUR PARTIES, THE PARTIES, OPERATOR, THE 21 LEA'S, ANY INTERESTED PARTIES COME FORWARD. AND I 22

THINK IT THEN GIVES YOU THE BASIS OF RELYING ON

- 24 YOUR OWN REGULATIONS.
- SO I WOULD SUGGEST REGULATIONS FOR

- 1 THOSE, BUT THE LEGAL OFFICE CLEARLY FEELS THAT WE
- 2 HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO DO THAT.
- 3 MEMBER RELIS: SO, MR. CHAIR, SHOULD WE
- 4 REQUEST THAT THIS BE BROUGHT BACK IN THE FORM OF A
- 5 CONSIDERATION ITEM? I DON'T KNOW WHETHER -- IS A
- 6 MONTH ADEQUATE?
- 7 MS. RICE: I DON'T THINK WE CAN DO SO BY
- 8 NOVEMBER. THE TITLES ARE ALREADY DUE FOR THAT
- 9 RIGHT NOW AS WE SPEAK, SO DECEMBER AT THE
- 10 EARLIEST. JANUARY WOULD BE PREFERABLE BECAUSE WHAT
- 11 WE NEED TO DO IS DEVELOP THE OPTIONS WE'VE
- 12 PRESENTED AS IDEAS TODAY, WORK WITH THE LEGAL
- OFFICE ON THE UNDERLYING AUTHORITY ISSUE, AND THAT
- 14 WILL DICTATE WHAT A LOT OF THE OPTIONS LOOK LIKE
- AND THAT WE DON'T NEED COMPLEX OPTIONS IF THE
- 16 AUTHORITY APPEARS FAIRLY BROAD.
- 17 CHAIRMAN JONES: AND YOU WILL HAVE A
- 18 COUPLE OF MORE LEA ROUND TABLES. AND THEN HOW
- 19 OFTEN DO YOU GO MEET WITH CCDEH?
- MS. RICE: MONTHLY.
- 21 CHAIRMAN JONES: WHY DON'T WE CALENDAR
- THIS FOR JANUARY?
- MS. TOBIAS: I THINK WE WERE ALSO -- AND,

- DOROTHY, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG -- I THINK WE'RE
- 25 ALREADY WORKING ON A CALENDAR. I KNOW THE

- 1 CHAIRMAN'S OFFICE HAS ASKED FOR ANY COMMENTS IN
- 2 TERMS OF DATES FOR NEXT YEAR, AND THEY'RE IN THE
- 3 PROCESS OF DEVELOPING THE CALENDAR FOR NEXT YEAR.
- 4 SO I THINK THAT WOULD KIND OF BE OUT AS A DRAFT
- 5 TYPE OF THING FOR EARLIER THAN JANUARY JUST TO LOOK
- 6 AT.
- 7 CHAIRMAN JONES: BUT I WOULD LIKE TO, I
- 8 THINK, IF NOTHING ELSE, JUST TO DISTRIBUTE MAYBE
- 9 THAT IDEA WITHIN THE NEXT 45 DAYS OR SO OF PERMITS
- 10 THAT HAVE COME IN AND WHERE THEY ARE IN
- 11 RELATIONSHIP TO OUR COMMITTEE MEETING, SO WE GET A
- 12 MORE QUANTITIVE --
- 13 MEMBER RELIS: ARE YOU THINKING OF THAT AS
- AN INFORMATION ITEM THAT WE WOULD HAVE?
- 15 CHAIRMAN JONES: YEAH. I DON'T KNOW IF WE
- 16 NEED TO HAVE AN ITEM IN COMMITTEE OR IF WE JUST
- 17 NEED TO GET IT DISTRIBUTED AND THEN BASED ON THAT,
- 18 WE GO TO THE NEXT STEP. I THINK WE JUST DO IT AS
- 19 AN INFORMATION ITEM IN THE FORM OF A MEMO TO GET AN
- 20 IDEA, AND THEN WE CAN TAKE THE NEXT STEP BASED ON
- 21 THAT, BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO SEE, YOU KNOW,
- JUST WHERE THE BARRIERS ARE OR WHERE THE, YOU KNOW,
- WHERE THE ISSUES ARE.

- 24 ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE CLEAR DIRECTION.
- 25 CLEAR UNDERSTANDING. WE HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

```
HEARING NONE, WE HAVE OPEN DISCUSSION. IF ANYBODY
 1
 2 WANTS TO SPEAK, OTHERWISE, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
 3
   THIS MEETING IS ADJOURNED.
 5
                  (MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 10:50
 6
      A.M.)
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
```